

Coupl. sets
Direct
11-12-35

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. V

AUGUST, 1934

No. 8

The Chief Principles of New Testament Textual Criticism.

In making the somewhat ambitious attempt of presenting in a brief article an account of the fundamental principles of textual criticism with respect to the New Testament, I am aware that many a reader will find some things not touched on which he would like to see treated; but considerations of space simply make it unavoidable that some material be omitted. All who would like to give this matter further study will find excellent guides in the following books: *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Vol. II. Introduction and Appendix by B. F. Westcott and J. F. O. Hort); *Einfuehrung in das griechische Neue Testament*, by E. Nestle, rewritten by von Dobschuetz; *Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, by B. Warfield; *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, by C. R. Gregory; *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, by A. T. Robertson; and *The Four Gospels*, by B. H. Streeter.

If we had the autographs of the apostles and evangelists, this article would be as superfluous as a dissertation on the topic that man is a living being. Again, if there were only one manuscript extant in which the text has come to us, textual criticism would play a very unimportant rôle, if it would be called for at all. We should merely carefully print this one manuscript and the task would be finished. Both conditions do not obtain. The autographs are lost; most likely they consisted of papyrus, which is fragile, and were, as has been said, literally "read to pieces" by their possessors. But we have thousands of manuscripts, written before the age of printing, in which the text of the New Testament has come down to us. How different is the situation for the New Testament if we compare it, *e. g.*, with that of the works of the Greek poet Aeschylus. The oldest manuscript of his works which we have dates from the tenth century of our era (the Medicean at Florence). There are other manuscripts containing his extant works, but they are much later, and, what must be carefully

noted, they are simply copies of said tenth-century manuscript (although some critics are willing to give them a more independent status). Aeschylus is held to have died about 450 B. C. Think of the vast span of time from his death to the copying of the oldest manuscript which we have of his tragedies. In the New Testament field we meet not only a truly amazing number of manuscripts, but we find that some of them are very old, separated from the age of the apostles by less than a century. I have here in mind especially the so-called Beatty Collection of papyri, which was lately brought to England and is said to contain manuscripts written in the third century, while one of them, we are told, was written as early as the first half of the second century, that is, only a few decades after the death of John the Apostle. The great number and the great variety of manuscripts of the New Testament, together with the versions in other tongues than the Greek and the quotations of the sacred text by early writers, have placed us in a very happy position, but constitute also our problem.

The old copies differ from each other in some respects, as is simply unavoidable, unless God performed a miracle every time the text of the New Testament was transcribed. What is surprising is not that there are many different readings, but that most of them are merely due to faulty copying, introducing errors which can at once be detected as such, and that but very few of these variant readings have any bearing on doctrine. It has been well said that we should have all the doctrines of the New Testament left intact even if we had to follow the most imperfectly written manuscript. In general, we must remember that this discussion has nothing to do with the doctrine of inspiration, because it was only the original autographs that were inspired and covered by the divine promise of infallibility. The copies present the inspired text to the extent to which they reproduce the original.

Naturally it is very important that, as we read our Greek New Testament and notice that the manuscripts differ in a number of passages, we should be able to determine which is the original reading. In most cases we shall be able to reach definite conclusions. Here and there, owing to human weakness, to lack of acumen and insight, we shall have to be satisfied with probabilities. When we engage in studies of this nature, we have to thank a small group of scholars for putting at our disposal the material enabling us to reach positive decisions. These men are chiefly Tischendorf, Gregory (an American who, however, became professor at Leipzig), Weiss, and von Soden, of Germany, and Tregelles, Scrivener, and Westcott and Hort, of England. The labors of the textual critics are not invested with the glamor attaching to works in which interesting new theories are propounded and defended. These scholars carefully list the readings of the various manuscripts and then endeavor to decide which are the

correct ones; and when they have finished and put the New Testament on our desk, we hardly notice the tremendous amount of patient labor which they spent on their task. But they, and not the higher critics with their often fantastic suggestions, arrived at not so much by dint of hard work as through enticing flights of the imagination, are the real benefactors of the theologian, anxious, as he is, to obtain the genuine text of the New Testament.

When we come to view the principles which must guide us in choosing between several variant readings, the first thing to do is to see in which manuscripts the respective readings are found. The principle which has to do with this point can be worded thus, "That reading is likely to be correct which is found in the best manuscripts." The question at once presents itself, Which are the best manuscripts? By common consent Codex Vaticanus (B) is one of them. It is, for one thing, a very carefully written manuscript, containing fewer errors due to neglect and haste than most other manuscripts. Again, it is the oldest one of the so-called great uncials which we possess. Uncial manuscripts are those which are written in capital letters, often called "majuscules." While the exact date of its writing is not known, experts hold that it originated around 330. There is no manuscript of the New Testament which commands our respect quite in the same degree as this famous codex. It is, however, not correct in every detail. Here and there a palpable error occurs, and hence it would be wrong for us simply to follow this codex. But in determining which reading to adopt, we at once ascertain the reading of B.

A close second to B in value is Codex Sinaiticus, discovered by Tischendorf in 1859. Its siglum is \aleph . As to its precise date, opinions differ somewhat. Some critics think it was written at the same time as B, although by a different scribe; others would date its origin half a century or more later. But at any rate it is a carefully written manuscript, and its readings must be given great weight.

Critics nowadays give special prominence to Codex Bezae (D) for the Gospels and Acts (these are the only books it contains), saying that it represents the readings of the so-called Western text, which, it is held, is the text that obtained quite universally in the second century. For the sake of simplicity I am here leaving other great MSS., such as Codex Ephraemi (C) and Codex Washington (W), out of consideration.

This, then, should be our first concern in making our choice as to the correct reading, to find what the three great manuscripts mentioned say on the passage in question. If they agree, there is one good piece of evidence that the reading they present is the right one. If they do not agree, it may be difficult for us to apply the principle under consideration. The peculiar circumstances of the case will have to decide. Naturally if B and D oppose \aleph , the preference lies

with their reading; if \aleph and D oppose B, we may likewise let the majority rule. But if B and \aleph are ranged together against D, we are in a quandary and had better leave the point undecided. The same advice holds for the situation where each one of the three has a reading differing from that of the others.

The second principle to be applied has to do with the territory or territories in which a certain reading is found. It has long been recognized that the extant MSS. must be grouped in classes. Westcott and Hort assumed four of them, the Neutral, the Alexandrian, the Syrian, and the Western. They gave most weight to the Neutral and least to the Syrian, or Byzantine, class. A more scientific and helpful rule has been submitted by Streeter in his book *The Four Gospels*. He tells us that we must think of five centers or territories from which manuscripts have come, namely, Alexandria, Antioch, Caesarea, Italy and Gaul (taken together), and Carthage. Having determined in which of these localities the various readings were circulated and adopted, we shall be able to decide which one of them was most universally followed in the ancient Church. The rule can be worded thus, "That reading which was most wide-spread is entitled to our approval." This of course does not apply to the so-called Textus Receptus, which was the almost universally accepted text during the Middle Ages. It really represents the text as it was found in Byzantium in the fifth century, and because Byzantium was the capital of the Roman Empire at the time, the text there in vogue came to be the generally accepted one. We must, says Dr. Streeter, go back to the time before the Byzantium text overran the Christian world and see what the situation was in the early centuries. But how are we to determine which readings obtained in the given localities? Streeter mentions the authorities. For Alexandria our best witness is B; for Antioch the Sinaitic Syriac; for Caesarea the Koridethi manuscript (Θ); for Italy and Gaul D, and for Carthage the old Latin manuscripts (*Vetus Latina*, often called *Itala*). Here I have given the manuscripts which Streeter calls "primary authority." His list next submits manuscripts that are a "secondary authority"; then such as are tertiary; furthermore, such as are supplementary; and, finally, the patristic evidence for the readings in the various localities. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 108. I have to add that the table of Streeter from which I have quoted pertains to the texts of our gospels. The Acts and the Epistles are not included in that particular study. It may interest my readers to know which manuscripts Streeter regards as possessing secondary authority: for Alexandria they are Codices \aleph and L and the early Egyptian translations (Sahidic and Bohairic); for Antioch, the Curetonian Syriac; for Caesarea, a number of minuscule (cursive) manuscripts: 1 and its family, 13 and its family, 28, 565, and 700; for Italy and Gaul, the old Latin manuscripts which are desig-

nated b and a; and for Carthage, the old Latin manuscript e, and Codex W in the Gospel according to St. Mark. The readings of the Beatty Papyri are not yet available for us. Experts who have examined them declare that the form of the text is that of Caesarea, which Professor Sanders of the University of Michigan calls one of the varieties of the Western text. Cf. *Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1933, Heft 4. It should be added that the papyri of the collection are fragments giving us only a small part of the New Testament. Cf. P. E. Kretzmann, *The New Testament in the Light of a Believer's Research* (1934), p. 47 ff.

In the third place, a principle must be considered which has to do with transcription, that is, with the copying itself. When we have to choose between variant readings, it is important that we attempt to see the situation from the point of view of the scribe or copyist. The third principle, then, which I submit is, "That reading is likely to be correct which cannot easily be traced back to the unintentional alteration of a copyist." Most of our variant readings, as was mentioned before, were due to an oversight on the part of the scribe, who was not careful enough or for some reason was not sufficiently well qualified for the important work he was doing. In comparing the various readings, I ask myself, Which one has all the earmarks of being due to a mere slip of the scribe? Naturally I conclude that such a reading is not the genuine one.

The fourth principle likewise has to do with transcriptional evidence. We know that scribes often were anxious to improve the text, correcting what they thought were evident errors of their predecessors. Having the good intention of preserving the Word of God unimpaired, they introduced changes, thinking that they were actually restoring the text to its pristine purity. That their course, whenever they made changes, was usually a mistaken one we can well see; but this tendency of theirs to correct what they considered erroneous is a factor with which we have to reckon. It would have been far better if they had followed the system of the editors of the Hebrew text, who carefully distinguished between *ketib* and *qere*, *scriptum et legendum*, putting the latter on the margin. But the early Greek copyists had no such system, and if they thought a change was necessary, they at once introduced it in the text. Thus in Matt. 13, 22, where the best manuscripts read: "the care of the world," some scribe felt that the expression was not clear enough and that undoubtedly Jesus had employed greater perspicuity, and so he added a pronoun, making the expression read: "the care of *this* world." A harmless addition, of course, it is, but he altered the text, and, moreover, altered it unnecessarily, the original being perfectly clear. The principle which we arrive at on the basis of this observation is, "That reading is likely to be the correct one of which it seems clear that it has not arisen

through the intentional alteration of a copyist." Since in making alterations the scribes thought they were improving the text, making it more easy to understand and to interpret, removing difficulties, apparent harshnesses, seeming contradictions, or doctrinal errors, this principle has been expressed thus, "The harder reading is likely to be the correct one" (*lectio difficilior praeferatur vulgationi* or *proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua*).

There is a fifth principle which can be employed. It may be expressed thus, "That reading is likely to be the correct one which best agrees with the style and diction and other characteristics of the author in question." This point has to do with what is called intrinsic evidence. It is but fair to assume that an author is consistent in his use of idioms and of striking expressions and that *ceteris paribus* he will not without special reason deviate from his accustomed terminology. If we, then, are confronted with variant readings between which we have to choose, we try to determine which one of them agrees best with the usual mode of thought and speech of the author, and the one which can thus qualify will receive our vote. A simple example to illustrate this rule can be taken from Luke 1, 25, where the question is whether the word *Kyrios* (Lord) should be given the article or not. Some manuscripts have it, others omit it. A careful reading of Luke's Gospel will reveal that, when he is speaking of God (without the distinction of Persons), he often uses *Kyrios* without the article, while the article is invariably present when he refers to our Lord Jesus Christ. (Cf. Luke 10, 1; 19, 34, etc.) We shall conclude therefore that the reading without the article is to be preferred in this case. The example is interesting because here we have an instance in which we shall not accept the reading of B, but rather follow that of \aleph and D. Quite naturally, however, this fifth rule is one which we shall invoke with great moderation and hesitancy, because of the difficulty of saying in a given instance whether or not a certain expression is in keeping with the writer's accustomed habits of expression.

We have now stated five principles which may guide us in choosing between variant readings. They are not all of equal importance, nor can we say that in all cases that come before us we should give the same weight to one particular rule. It may be that at times the second rule will be stressed more by us than the first, and in another case the situation may be just the reverse. Everything depends on the circumstances of the individual case. There may be instances where merely the third or the fourth of the rules given can be employed. In such a case we shall simply ignore the others, although it will be done regretfully. But it is quite safe to say that by careful application of the rules given it will be possible to determine which reading should be adopted.

In conclusion, it may be serviceable if I present an example show-

ing how I conceive of the application of the principles submitted above. Let the reader, if he please, open his New Testament at Luke 10, 1. The question here is whether St. Luke wrote "seventy" or "seventy-two" when he gave the number of the other disciples whom our Lord sent out to prepare the people for His coming. The Nestle text, following Westcott and Hort, puts "two" in brackets. We shall now apply our five principles as far as we can. The first question is, What do the best manuscripts say? A glance at the critical apparatus in Nestle's text tells us that B and D contain the numeral two; hence from the point of view of the best manuscripts "seventy-two" is the right reading. In the second place, we ask, Which reading was the more wide-spread? By means of the critical apparatus we can state that the reading "seventy" was found in Egypt (Codex B here occupies an isolated position among the Alexandrian, or Egyptian, MSS.), in Carthage, and apparently in Caesarea, while the reading "seventy-two" is quite definitely established for Rome and Antioch. This rule favors the reading "seventy." Applying our third principle, which has to do with unintentional alterations, it seems that it was more easy for the scribe, being not overcareful, to omit the "two" than to add it; hence this rule rather speaks for "seventy-two." When we apply the fourth rule, we are confronted with a real difficulty. Was the scribe more inclined to change the "seventy" to "seventy-two" or *vice versa*? It is difficult to see why any one should have intentionally here made a change. Some critics have thought the number 70 would appeal to scribes and appear correct to them because in Gen. 10 seventy nations are mentioned. Others again have held that the number 72 would have special attraction because that would mean six messengers for each one of the twelve tribes of Israel. We shall be compelled to admit that it is impossible for us to apply rule number four in this case. Th. Zahn is of a different opinion. "*Entscheidend fuer die Urspruenglichkeit von 72 duerfte sein, dass eine Abrundung der Zahl 72 auf 70 ebenso begreiflich, wie die Veraenderung der solennen Zahl 70 in 72 befremdlich waere.*" (*Das Ev. des Lukas*, p. 408.) Now how about the fifth rule? Very clearly, the style of the author cannot have any bearing on this question at all. Luke could just as well have written "seventy" as "seventy-two." Some commentators hold that Luke, as a pupil of St. Paul and an eloquent exponent of the doctrine of universal grace, must have written "seventy," because this number represents all the nations of the world according to Gen. 10; but this view we have to reject because it attributes to the holy writer motives in telling the story of the life of Jesus which are not in keeping with historical truthfulness. We have to say, then, that this fifth principle likewise does not yield any results for us. See, then, what we have. Rules one and three favor seventy-two, rule two seventy, while application of the others has merely yielded negative results. On the

basis of the evidence we shall, so it seems to me, have to give the preference to the reading "seventy-two." This example, chosen altogether at random, undoubtedly is not the best one that could have been presented, but I trust that the application of the rules as I have attempted it will give an idea of how the principles of textual criticism can be used.

The above technique, as I intimated before, really applies only to the gospels. For the other books of the New Testament a different classification of manuscripts would have to be drawn up, which I shall not attempt in this article. Everybody can see that this subject is beset with some difficulties, but it should be apparent, too, that it is well possible for us to reach certainty as to the right reading in the various passages of the New Testament where we meet *variae lectiones* and that the grand promise stands secure: *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum*.

W. ARNDT.

Zur Lehre von der Reue.

IV.

Gehört der Voratz, von der Sünde abzustehen und Gott zu leben, zu der dem Glauben vorhergehenden Reue? Viele lutherische Lehrbücher bejahen diese Frage. Bei Luthardt heißt es: „Der von Gott gewirkte innere Vorgang der Besehrung beginnt mit dem Selbstgericht der Buße, welche in der Sinnesänderung besteht, die sich vollzieht in Sündenbekenntnis, Sündenschmerz und im ernstlichen Willen, mit der Sünde zu brechen, um Gott zu leben.“ (Luthardt-Jesse, Komp. der Dog., 394.) Luthardt redet hier von der Reue. Er hatte kurz vorher gesagt: „Die Zeichen einer wahren Reue sind (die inneren): Unterlassen des Bösen und Verlangen nach Heiligung.“ Rohnert vertritt dieselbe Ansicht: „Das Mittel aber, durch welches der Heilige Geist die Besehrung zuwege bringt, ist . . . das Wort Gottes, und zwar zunächst das des Gesetzes, sodann das des Evangeliums. Durch die Predigt des Gesetzes wird dem Menschen die Größe seiner Schuld, sein ganzes sündliches Verderben aufgedeckt und Gottes Zorn über die Sünde, so daß er sie mit innerem Entsetzen erkennt, in seinem Gewissen darüber erschrickt und schmerzliche Reue empfindet (contritio cordis, terrores incussi conscientiae). Er fühlt jetzt seine ganze Fluchwürdigkeit, fühlt die Todes Schmerzen der Sünde, fühlt das Unvermögen, sich selbst zu ändern und vor Gott zu existieren. Da ist sein Herz voll Angst und Leid, voll Gram und Scham, voll göttlicher Traurigkeit (λύπη τοῦ θεοῦ), 2 Kor. 7, 10, voll Abscheu und Haß gegen die Sünde (Ps. 97, 10; 6, 9), die ihn in ein solches Elend gebracht hat. Darum wendet er sich von ihr ab, sagt sich von ihr los. Fern von aller Selbstentschuldigung bekennet er reumütig seine Schuld (Ps. 32, 3, 5; Spr. 28, 13; 1 Hohel.

1, 8. 9); er klagt sich selbst an und schreit in der Angst seines Herzens: „Ich elender Mensch! Wer wird mich erlösen von dem Leibe dieses Todes?“ So durchzittert ihn in diesem Leidtragen über die Sünde das Gefühl des Todes als der Sünden Sold; seine Seele erfährt ein Sterben (Röm. 7, 10 f.), der natürliche Sinn zerbricht (mortificatio; Apol., 174). Aber das alles ist doch erst die negative Seite der Buße.“ (Die Dog. d. ev.-luth. K., 357.) C. E. Lindberg versteht den guten Vorsatz auch auf dasselbe Gebiet: „We define contrition as follows: Contrition is that change of mind or heart in man in relation to sin made known through the illumination by the Law, which manifests itself in deep sorrow and fear of conscience because of sin together with a detestation of sin and a faithful endeavor to be rid of it. . . . The marks of true contrition may also be presented as follows: 1) *Internal*: a) knowledge of sin and the consciousness of God's wrath on account of sin; b) sorrow and anguish of conscience; c) detestation of sin and therefore an internal resolution to forsake sin; d) yearning for redemption. 2) *External*. . .“ (Chr. Dog., 315 f.) Auch J. Stump — um hier noch einen aus vielen anzuführen — zieht den ernstlichen Haß gegen die Sünde in die vom Gesetz gewirkte, dem Glauben vorhergehende Reue: „The Law was given to convince men of sin. This is its function in conversion. Through the preaching of the Law man learns to know his sin and helplessness and the wrath of God against him on account of sin. When this fact is pressed home upon his consciousness, there ensues distress of conscience and deep humility before God. He feels his unworthiness and is filled with sorrow, shame, and confusion and with a detestation of the sins which he once loved. He ceases to excuse or extenuate them, acknowledges them as transgressions of the Law of a good and holy God, and longs for mercy and forgiveness. This is contrition, the negative side of conversion.“ (The Chr. Faith, 255 f.)

In andern lutherischen Lehrbüchern hingegen fehlt bei der Begriffsbestimmung der Gesetzesreue der gute Vorsatz durchaus. Nach diesen gehört er nicht zu der Reue. J. Pieper lehrt: Das Wort Buße bezeichnet in der engeren Bedeutung „die Reue (contritio), das heißt, die durch das Gesetz gewirkte Erkenntnis der Sünden (terrores conscientiae)“ — der gute Vorsatz wird nicht erwähnt. „Die Befehrung besteht darin, daß der Mensch unter den terrores conscientiae, das heißt, unter Verzeiſung an aller eigenen Moral und an allem eigenen Tun, an das Evangelium (an Christum, an den gnädigen Gott usw.) gläubig wird.“ Wieder nichts von dem guten Vorsatz! „Wird die Befehrung durch das Evangelium unter Zuhilfenahme des Gesetzes gewirkt, so sind damit auch schon die inneren Vorgänge bezeichnet, unter denen eine Befehrung sich vollzieht. Es sind dies a) die Gewissensschrecken (terrores conscientiae), welche das Herz ob der aus dem Gesetz erkannten Sünde empfindet, Apost. 16, 29. 30: *ἐντρομος γένόμε-*

νος... ἐφη· κύριοι, τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν, ἵνα σωθῶ; b) das Vertrauen des Herzens (fiducia cordis) auf die Vergebung der Sünden, welche im Evangelium zugesagt wird, Apost. 16, 31. Zur Besehrung gehören also Reue und Glaube.“ (Chr. Dog. II, 545. 551. 604.) Des guten Vor-
 satzes wird bei der Beschreibung der Reue geflissentlich geschwiegen. G. Stöckhardt definiert so: „Diese Reue ist nichts als ‚Schrecken des Gewissens‘, ‚eitel Zorn und Verzweiflung‘. Das Gesetz macht Sünde und Übertretung im Gewissen des Sünders lebendig und füllt das Herz darum mit Angst, Furcht, Zorn, Schrecken der Hölle. So weit führt das Gesetz den Menschen — bis in die Hölle.“ (Lehre u. Behre, 33, 158.) Dietrichs Katechismus, Frage 138: „Was ist die Reue? Die Reue ist die ernstliche und wahrhaftige Traurigkeit des Herzens, welches um seiner aus dem göttlichen Gesetz erkannten Sünden willen vor Gottes Zorn und dessen gerechten Strafen erschrocken und betrübt ist.“ E. Hove: “This contrition is wrought by God through the Law and is a distressing sense of God’s wrath against sin.” (*Christian Doctrine*, 253.) M. Roh: “By the Law is the knowledge of sin,” Rom. 3, 20. When this enters the soul with its divine demands and penalties, from which there is no escape, the effect is either rage and recklessness in declaring war against the imposition of intolerable burdens or the terrors of contrition. ‘The soul that sinneth, it shall die.’ When it has realized that it has sinned and read its sentence, whither shall it flee for comfort? Its own conscience condemns it, and it can find no solace there. The conscience of all men condemns him in his own confession of guilt and can give him no comfort. His only possible help could be in God, and He reveals His wrath against all ungodliness of men. Condemned of all, helpless and hopeless, whither shall he flee from the hell within him and all around him? That is contrition as the result of an earnest acceptance of the Law of God with its righteous requirements and its terrible denunciation of wrath upon the soul that sinneth.” Kein Wort vom guten Voratz! “The knowledge of sin, the consciousness of its guilt, the compunctions of conscience for the transgression of the divine Law in its holiness, are all necessary to prepare the sinner for the reception of the grace of Christ offered in the Gospel. They thus constitute an indispensable part of repentance.” Beharrlich wird des guten Voratzes geschwiegen! (*The Augsburg Confession*, 745.)

Die einen machen den guten Voratz zu einem wesentlichen Bestandteil der Reue. Die andern weigern sich, bei der Begriffsbestimmung der Reue auch nur ein Wörtlein von dem guten Voratz zu reden. Das haben sie ihrer Augsburgerischen Konfession und den andern Bekenntnisschriften der lutherischen Kirche abgelernt. „Und ist wahre, rechte Buße eigentlich Reue und Leid oder Schrecken haben über die Sünde (contritio seu terrores incussi conscientiae agnito peccato) und doch daneben glauben an das Evangelium. . . . Danach soll auch Besserung

folgen und daß man von Sünden ablasse.“ (Augsb. Konf., Art. XII.) Der gute Vorsatz ist da; aber erst, wenn der Glaube vorhanden ist, ist er da. Wo von der Reue die Rede ist, die dem Glauben vorhergeht, wird von der Lebensbesserung nichts gesagt. Die Apologie redet im XII. Artikel des weiteren davon, findet aber für den guten Vorsatz keinen Platz in der durch das Gesetz gewirkten Reue. „Wir sagen, daß contritio oder rechte Reue das sei, wenn das Gewissen erschreckt wird und seine Sünde und den großen Zorn Gottes über die Sünde anhebt zu fühlen, und ist ihm leid, daß es gesündigt hat. Und dieselbe contritio geht also zu, wenn unsere Sünde durch Gottes Wort gestraft wird.“ (§ 29 f.) Genau so die Schmalkaldischen Artikel: „Das ist nun die Donnerart [der Blitzstrahl] Gottes, damit er beide die offenbaren Sündler und falschen Heiligen in einen Haufen schlägt und läßt keinen recht haben, treibt sie allesamt in das Schrecken und Verzagen. Das ist der Hammer (wie Jeremias spricht): ‚Mein Wort ist ein Hammer, der die Felsen zerschmettert.‘ Das ist nicht activa contritio, eine gemachte Reue, sondern passiva contritio, das rechte Herzeleid, Leiden und Fühlen des Todes.“ (P. III, Art. III, § 2.) Nicht anders weiß es die Konkordienformel: „Durch dieses Mittel, nämlich die Predigt und Gehör seines Wortes, wirkt Gott und bricht unsere Herzen und zeucht [zieht] den Menschen, daß er durch die Predigt des Gesetzes seine Sünde und Gottes Zorn erkennt und wahrhaftiges Schrecken, Reue und Leid im Herzen empfindet und durch die Predigt und Betrachtung des heiligen Evangelii von der gnadenreichen Vergebung der Sünden in Christo ein Fünkchen des Glaubens in ihm angezündet wird.“ (Sol. Decl. II, § 54.) Und wie Luther in den Schmalkaldischen Artikeln definiert, definiert er auch sonst: „Doch nun wollen wir auf den Psalm [51.] kommen. Hier wird uns die Lehre von der rechten Buße vorgetragen. Es sind aber bei der rechten Buße zwei Stücke: die Erkenntnis der Sünde und die Erkenntnis der Gnade oder, um bekanntere Benennungen zu gebrauchen, die Furcht vor Gott und die Zuversicht zu seiner Barmherzigkeit. Diese beiden Stücke hält uns David in diesem Gebete vor, gleichsam in einem herrlichen Gemälde, damit wir sie ansehen sollen. Denn im Anfang des Psalms sehen wir, wie er in Not stecke durch die Erkenntnis der Sünde und die Beschwerung seines Gewissens; am Ende aber tröstet er sich durch die Zuversicht auf die Güte Gottes.“ (V, 475. Vgl. XI, 709 bis 715.)

Und denen, die mit dem Lutherischen Bekenntnis es ablehnen, den guten Vorsatz aus der Gesetzesreue hervorgehen zu lassen oder mit ihr zu verbinden, gibt die Schrift recht. Die Schrift lehrt, daß der Unbesehrte den guten Vorsatz nicht fassen kann, auch nicht durch Wirkung des Gesetzes, daß vielmehr der gute Vorsatz sich nur in dem Herzen des Gläubigen findet. Wenn die Schrift darstellt, was für Pläne, Entschlüsse, Vorsätze in den natürlichen Herzen sich bilden, so sagt sie: „Aus dem Herzen kommen arge Gedanken: Mord“ usw., Matth. 15, 19.

Nirgends sagt sie, daß auch zuzeiten sich die guten Vorsätze regen, die angeborne Sündenliebe auszurotten. Es heißt vielmehr, daß in dem Fleisch nichts Gutes wohnt, Röm. 7, 18. Solange der Mensch noch nicht zum Glauben gekommen ist, ist er „tot“, Eph. 2, 5, ohne jegliche Kraft zum Guten, lebendig aber im Bösen, beseelt von der „Feindschaft wider Gott“, Röm. 8, 7. Die Schrift gibt somit den Bekenntnisschriften recht, wenn diese z. B. in Artikel II der Augsburgerischen Konfession, „Von der Erbsünde“, und in Artikel I der Konkordienformel, „Von der Erbsünde“, dem unbekehrten Menschen alle und jede Kraft, Fähigkeit, Neigung, Disposition zum Guten absprechen, und wenn sie die Lehre, daß der unbekehrte Mensch „Gottes Gesetz mit [dem] Herzen gehorsam sein könne“, daß „der Mensch aus seinen natürlichen Kräften den Anfang zum Guten machen könne“ (F. C., Sol. Decl. II, § 75 sq.), als groben pelagianischen und papistischen Irrtum bezeichnet. Nach der Lehre der Schrift kann der gute Vorsatz auch nicht unter der Wirkung des Gesetzes zustande kommen. Das Gesetz kann nur „töten“, 2 Kor. 3, 6, kann nicht Lebenskräfte einflößen, kann nur die Kräfte des Todes erregen, Röm. 7, 5. 8, den Haß gegen Gott und die Lust zum Bösen zu immer völligerem Ausbruch bringen. Die Schrift gibt somit dem Bekenntnis recht, wenn es die Wirkung des Gesetzes also beschreibt: „Wo aber das Gesetz solch sein Amt allein treibt ohne Zutun des Evangelii, da ist der Tod und die Hölle, und muß der Mensch verzweifeln wie Saul und Judas, wie St. Paulus sagt: „Das Gesetz tötet durch die Sünde“ (Schmalk. Art., P. III, Art. III, § 7), wie dies von Luther anderswo so beschrieben wird: „Wenn einem Menschen durch das Gesetz die Sünde offenbart wird, der Tod, Zorn und Gericht Gottes, Hölle usw., so ist es unmöglich, daß er nicht ungeduldig werde, nicht murre, Gott und seinen Willen hasse. . . . Darum verursacht das Gesetz, daß man Gott aufs höchste hasse, und das heißt nicht allein, daß man durch das Gesetz die Sünde sehe und erkenne, sondern auch, daß durch dies Kundtun [der Sünde] die Sünde vermehrt, angefaßt (inflari), entzündet und groß gemacht wird. . . . Wenn die Sünde nur so offenbart worden ist durch die Strahlen, welche das Gesetz ins Herz wirft, ist dem Menschen nichts verhaßter und unerträglicher als das Gesetz. . . . Das, wovor man flieht, liebt man nicht, sondern hat einen Widerwillen dagegen; man wird nicht dadurch ergötzt, sondern haßt es aufs äußerste. Darum zeigt diese Flucht an, daß das menschliche Herz einen unbegrenzten Haß gegen das Gesetz habe und folglich auch gegen Gott selbst, den Urheber des Gesetzes.“ (IX, 416. 424. Zu Gal. 3, 19.) „Es steht also die Meinung fest, daß ohne die Gnade das Gesetz tötet und die Sünde vermehrt; obgleich es äußerlich die Hand in Schranken hält, so entzündet es doch inwendig den Geist wider seinen Willen um so mehr. Da nun der Sünder, dem vor der Gnade befohlen worden ist, seine Sünden zu erforschen, notwendigerweise des Gesetzes Gottes eingedenk sein muß, gegen welches er gesündigt hat, so ist es notwendig, daß er die

Lüste wieder aufreizen und das Gesetz hassen muß, zu welchem allein die Gnade Liebe gibt.“ (XVIII, 852.)

Im positiver Darstellung lehrt die Schrift, daß der gute Vorsatz sich nur in dem Herzen des Gläubigen findet. Denn nur im Herzen des Gläubigen findet sich Leben, das neue, das geistliche Leben. „Ihr seid auferstanden durch den Glauben“, Kol. 2, 12; vgl. Eph. 2, 1—8. Und der Erweis, die Folge, des geistlichen Wesens sind die guten Werke, influssive des guten Vorsatzes, des Anfangs der guten Werke. Ehe von guten Werken und guten Vorsätzen die Rede sein kann, muß der Mensch zum Glauben gebracht werden. Wo allein die Reue vorhanden ist, ist nichts als Tod. Aber „haec fides vivificat contritos“. (Apol. XII, 36.) Und dieser Glaube ist es, der in der Liebe, auf dem Gebiet der guten Werke, zur Hervorbringung des guten Vorsatzes tätig ist, Gal. 5, 6. Der Mann, der sagte: „Das Gute, das ich will“, „ich habe Lust an Gottes Gesetz“, ich setze mir vor, die Gebote meines lieben Gottes zu erfüllen, Röm. 7, 19. 22, war ein solcher, der durch den Glauben der Erlösung Christi theilhaftig geworden war. Die Aufforderung: „Tut rechtschaffene Früchte der Buße!“ Matth. 3, 8, schließt in sich, daß man zuvor bekehrt sein muß, ehe man Früchte der Buße hervorbringen kann. Erst Leben, Glaube, dann Früchte! Die Schrift gibt darum dem Bekenntnis recht, wenn es sagt: „Denn das ist einmal wahr, daß in wahrhaftiger Bekehrung müsse eine Änderung, neue Regung und Bewegung im Verstand, Willen und Herzen geschehen, daß nämlich das Herz die Sünde erkenne, vor Gottes Zorn sich fürchte, von der Sünde sich abwende, die Verheißung der Gnade in Christo erkenne und annehme, gute geistliche Gedanken, christlichen Vorsatz (bonum propositum) und Fleiß habe und wider das Fleisch streite.“ (F. C., Sol. Deel. II, § 70.) Nur im Bekehrten findet sich der gute, christliche Vorsatz. „Wenn aber der Mensch bekehrt worden und also erleuchtet ist und sein Wille verneuert, alsdann so will der Mensch Gutes (sofern er neu geboren oder ein neuer Mensch ist) und hat Lust am Gesetz Gottes nach dem innerlichen Menschen.“ (§ 63; vgl. § 85.) Der gute, christliche Vorsatz ist eine Frucht des Glaubens: „Wir glauben, lehren und bekennen, daß, obwohl vor[her]gehende Reue und nachfolgende gute Werke nicht in den Artikel der Rechtfertigung vor Gott gehören, jedoch soll nicht ein solcher Glaube gedichtet werden, der bei und neben einem bösen Vorsatz zu sündigen und wider das Gewissen zu handeln, sein und bleiben könne; sondern nachdem der Mensch durch den Glauben gerechtfertigt worden, alsdann ist ein wahrhaftiger, lebendiger Glaube durch die Liebe tätig, Gal. 5, also daß die guten Werke dem gerechtmachenden Glauben allezeit folgen und bei demselben, da er rechtschaffen und lebendig, gewißlich erfunden werden.“ (F. C., Epit. III, § 11.) Das Bekenntnis hat diese Reihenfolge: „Buße, Glauben und guten Vorsatz“ (F. C., S. D. XI, § 11). Der gute Vorsatz folgt auf den Glauben!

„... welcher Glaube wiederum das Herz tröstet und zufrieden macht. Danach soll auch Besserung folgen und daß man von Sünden lasse; denn dies sollen die Früchte der Buße sein, wie Johannes spricht Matth. 3, 8: „Wirket rechtschaffene Früchte der Buße!“ (Ausg. Konf. XII.)

Daß das die Lehre Luthers und der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften ist, daß nämlich die Gesetzesreue nicht den guten Voratz einschließt, dieser vielmehr eine Frucht des Glaubens ist, das ist weltbekannt. Der Lutheraner Elert weiß es. „Und so ist es der abschließende Ausdruck für Luthers Lehre von der Buße, wenn er sagt, sie bestehe et seria agnitione peccati et apprehensione promissionis (Weimar-Ausgabe 44, 175, 4 ff.). Dieselbe Auffassung von der Buße vertreten die Bekenntnisse wie die späteren Dogmatiker. . . . Und umgekehrt, in der vorher zitierten Predigt heißt es: „Buß in seinem namen“ ist also getan: die an Christum glauben, gibt er durch denselben glauben besserung nicht ein augenblick oder ein stund lang, sonder das ganz leben durch (12, 514, 30). Auch hier erfolgt das converti als Wendung vom Unglauben zum Glauben, aber im Glauben auch als „einer enderung und besserung des ganzen lebens.“ (Morphologie des Luthertums, I, 128 f.) G. Plitt weiß es. „Weil Luther dies erfahren hatte, verwarf er das gesamte bisherige Bußwesen: es führe nicht zum Frieden mit Gott; es sei von Anfang bis zu Ende Selbstrechtfertigung und vernichte also das Werk Christi; es lehre die Sünde nicht wirklich kennen, sondern verführe zur Heuchelei. Zur wahren Sündenerkenntnis und zum wirklichen Hass der Sünde als solcher, als Übertretung des heiligen Willens Gottes und nicht bloß als Ursache von mancherlei Übeln komme der Christ vom Glauben, von der Liebe zu Gott, aus. . . . Der so Wiedergeborene und in neuem Leben Stehende liebe Gott durch den Heiligen Geist; von da an hasse er von Herzen die Sünde als gottwidrig.“ (Einleitung in die Augustana, 343. 347.) Die Herzog-Haude-Nealenzkylopädie weiß es. „In betreff des Verhältnisses von contritio und fides ist ungenauen und unrichtigen älteren und neueren Darstellungen gegenüber besonders noch zu bemerken, daß nach Luthers Lehre die Zerknirschung, soweit sie dem Glauben vorangeht, keineswegs schon wahre Überwindung der Sünde und innere sittliche Erneuerung ist, daß sie vielmehr ohne Heilsbotschaft und Glauben zu einer bloßen Reinsbuße würde und eine wahrhaft gottgemäße Abkehr von der Sünde und Hingabe an Gott immer schon Glauben voraussetzt und auf ihm ruht.“ (S. v. Buße.) Der liberale G. Weßring weiß es. Er vertritt durchaus nicht Luthers Theologie, aber über diesen Punkt kann er nicht anders als so referieren: „Was geschieht vielmehr? Beugt er“ (der Mensch, der sich von der Hand des heiligen Gottes gepackt sieht) „sich unter das Todesurteil? überläßt er sich bedingungslos der Heiligkeit Gottes, deren Gewalt er sich überantwortet weiß? Das hieße sie willig anerkennen. Aber noch die Konkordienformel weiß etwas davon, daß das Gesetz ohne Christus in Verzweiflung treibt, was etwas sehr anderes ist als ein Sterbenwollen zu Ehren Gottes. Wer-

zweifelung, Verstockung, Groll gegen Gott, sich in die Hölle gestoßen wissen und zugleich sich dawider auflehnen, das ist die Folge dieser Er-
schütterung. Dafür zeugt, wie erwähnt, Luther selbst, wenn er, rück-
blickend auf seine entscheidenden Seelenkämpfe, eben von seinem Haß,
seinem Murren gegen Gott spricht und wenn er am Ende dieser Linie
den Verzweiflungsschmerz Kains, Sauls, des Judas und aller gegen
Gottes Barmherzigkeit Mißtrauischen sieht (vgl. Dreuß, Disput. Luthers,
S. 253, These 9). Das ist etwas anderes als Haß gegen die Sünde aus
Liebe zu Gott (Dreuß, S. 254, These 22: *ex amore Dei peccatum*
odisse); das ist völliges Verstricktwerden in Sünde, Heimgesuchtwerden
vom Zorne Gottes.“ (Geschichte und Glaube, 275 f.)

Und der reformierte Schneckenburger weiß es. „Wenn auf Me-
landthons Vorgang auch *propositum novae obedientiae* nicht selten zu
der *poenitentia* hinzugezogen wird, so geschieht dies nur durch eine
Antizipation dessen, was unter dem Hinzutreten noch mehrerer neueren
Faktoren allerdings die positive Seite jener negativen *contritio* werden
soll. Der justifizierte *filius Dei* will und wird als Kind Gottes leben;
nicht aber kann er in der That schon dies wahre *propositum* fassen, ehe er
ein Kind Gottes ist, oder sein vorheriges *propositum* ist ein noch kraft-
loses, das erst durch die Justifikation und die *datio Spiritus* zum wirk-
lichen Beginn der *nova obedientia* wird. Ja schon das *odium* und die
detestatio peccati, welche zur *contritio* gehört, ist von der Art, daß sie
nur nach e i n e r Seite dem Glauben vorhergeht, nach der andern aber
ihm erst folgt. Hoffmann, S. 172: „*Odium et detestatio peccati* par-
tim antecedit fidem, et eatenus est ex lege, orta nimirum ex agnitione
peccati et reatus irae divinae, partim fidem demum sequitur, prout
scilicet cum amore iustitiae et cum sincero vitam emendandi et pec-
cata in posterum fugiendi proposito coniuncta est, et sub hoc respectu
est effectus evangelii.“ . . . Allein die Differenz“ (zwischen lutherischer
und reformierter Theologie) „ist doch eine größere als diese bloß for-
melle. Eben daß dem die Bekehrung wirkenden Geiste ausdrücklich ein
Strafamt zugeschrieben, daß dieses Strafen als ein für sich abgeschlosse-
nes Moment fixiert, die Wirkung des Gesetzes schlechthin als das Ver-
damnis und Zorn Schaffende gesetzt wird, ohne dem darauf bezüglichen
Bewußtsein schon eine positive Hinnéigung zu ihm, einem *amor Dei*, und
eine dadurch motivierte *aversio* von der Sünde zu geben, das hängt mit
dem viel intensiveren Schuldgefühl des Lutheraners zusammen, welches
vor allem Befriedigung verlangt. Der natürliche Zustand, wie er sich
dem sittlichen Bewußtsein darbietet, erweckt vor allem das Bewußtsein
der Schuld, erscheint als eine dem Subjekt zuzurechnende Abnormität.
Dieser Moment wird für sich festgehalten als der erste, den das Bewußt-
werden des Göttlichen hervorruft. Dasselbe wirkt nur niederschlagend;
die Erhabenheit und Größe des Gesetzes schlägt nieder, und alle Be-
tätigung des Subjekts geht in dieser Empfindung auf. Indem sie sich
aber vollendet, ist das Sündliche innerlich zurückgenommen, und der neue

Reim beginnt zu sprossen, die positive Mitteilung des Göttlichen hebt an, es schlägt in Glauben um, durch das Evangelium hervorgerufen. Hase-reffer, S. 405: „Ideo requiritur contritio, ut peccatorum magnitudine et gravitate cognita Christus cum beneficiis suis tanto magis dulcescat.“ Nun erst, placato Deo, entsteht das propositum novae obedientiae, die fuga peccati aus Liebe zu Gott usw. als die Praxis der Heiligung. Der Reformierte sieht im Bewußtwerden der Sünde schon einen Akt der Gottesverwandtschaft. . . .“ (Vgl. Darst. d. luth. und ref. Lehrbegriffs, II, 117—121.) Sätze wie: „Das Sündliche ist innerlich zurückgenommen“; „es schlägt in Glauben um“ geben keine genaue Darstellung der lutherischen Lehre; aber das ist genuin lutherische Lehre, wie Schneckenburger richtig erkennt und mit zwei Zitaten belegt: das propositum novae obedientiae, der gute, christliche Vorsatz, ist effectus evangelii; er entsteht erst placato Deo.

Der gute, ernstliche Vorsatz, mit der Sünde zu brechen und Gott zu leben, entsteht nicht durch Wirkung des Gesetzes. Allerdings bringt das Fordern und Drängen des Gesetzes eine Art „guten“ Vorsatzes zuwege. Der vom Gesetz Betroffene nimmt sich vor, die Sünde, die ihm solchen Jammer eingebracht hat, nicht wieder zu tun. Die Majestät Gottes zwingt dem Sünder die Erkenntnis seiner Verpflichtung gegen Gott ab. Es reute Judas, daß er unschuldig Blut verraten hatte, und es stand ihm fest, daß er gegebenenfalls diese Sünde nicht wiederholen würde. Der Säufer nimmt sich vor, sein Sausen zu lassen. Und um so mehr gibt sich der, der mit dem Gesetz umgeht, mit „guten“ Vorsätzen ab, als er meint, daß er dadurch dem Fluch des Gesetzes entgehen könne. „So groß ist die Torheit des menschlichen Herzens, daß er in diesem Kampf des Gewissens, wenn das Gesetz sein Amt ausgeübt hat, nicht allein nicht die Lehre von der Gnade ergreift, welche ihm aufs gewisseste die Vergebung der Sünden um Christi willen verheißt und anbietet, sondern sogar noch nach mehr Gesetzen sucht, durch welche er Rat für sich schaffen will. Er sagt: Wenn ich länger lebe, so will ich mein Leben bessern, dies oder jenes tun. Desgleichen: Ich will in ein Kloster gehen, aufs kümmerlichste leben, mit Wasser und Brot zufrieden sein, barfuß gehen usw.“ (Luther, IX, 417.) So fehlt es hier nicht an „guten“ Vorsätzen. Aber „ehe er ein Kind Gottes ist, ist sein propositum ein noch kraftloses“. Die Kraft, mit der Sünde zu brechen, ist nicht vorhanden. O ja, in einzelnen Fällen gelingt es ihm, seinen Vorsatz, diese oder jene Tugend zu üben, auszuführen. Mancher Säufer hält seine Sauflust im Zügel. Aber gar oft bleibt es bei dem bloßen Vorsatz. Sein propositum ist kraftlos. Und das vor allem, weil die Kraft zur Heiligung, die Liebe zu Gott, der wahre Haß gegen die Sünde, nicht vorhanden ist. Er kann, wie gesagt, einzelne Äußerungen der Sünde unterdrücken, aber die Liebe zur Sünde kann er nicht unterdrücken. Er will es ja nicht! Er hängt mit allen Fasern seines Herzens an der Sünde. Er läßt eine Sünde, um der andern desto eifriger zu dienen. Das Sündliche ist seine Lust,

eben weil es das Widergöttliche ist. „Die etwaige Lebensänderung, die das Gesetz zur Folge hat, ist nur eine äußerliche, nur ein Zurückschrecken vor der Sünde ihrer bösen Folgen wegen, nicht innere Abneigung gegen die Sünde selber, nicht Lust und Willigkeit zum Guten.“ (Lehre u. Wehre, 63, 276.) Sein „guter“ Vorsatz ist nicht ein „christlicher Vorsatz“ (F. C.), sondern im Grunde Heuchelwerk. — Der vom Gesetz Getroffene, noch nicht vom Evangelium Ergriffene befindet sich in einer wahrhaft verzweifelten Lage. Er weiß, daß seine Sünde, seine sündige Art, ihm die Verdammnis einbringt. Er verflucht sie — und doch liebt er sie. Er kann nicht und will nicht von der sündigen Art lassen — er verflucht sich selbst und flucht seinem Gott, der ihn wegen seiner Sündenliebe verflucht. Und ein solcher Mensch sollte eines guten Vorsatzes fähig sein? Nein; nur da, wo die christliche Reue ist, die aus Liebe zu Gott und der Heiligkeit hervorgegangene Betrübniß über die Sünde, findet sich der „christliche Vorsatz und Fleiß“, wider das Fleisch zu streiten (F. C.).

Nur der Besehrte ist des guten Vorsatzes fähig. Wegen der weiten Verbreitung der gegenteiligen Ansicht (der theils Mißverständnis und Verwirrung der Begriffe, theils falsche Lehre zugrunde liegt — was in dem Schlußartikel dieser Abhandlung zur Sprache kommen soll) muß dieser Punkt stark betont werden. Der Leser wolle sich darum nicht ermüden lassen, wenn wir ihm noch eine Anzahl Aussprüche lutherischer Theologen darbieten, die dieses tun. Luther: „Das erste Stück der Buße, nämlich Leid, ist allein aus dem Gesetz; das andere Stück, nämlich der gute Vorsatz [das Leben zu bessern], kann nicht aus dem Gesetze sein. . . . Die Buße, welche das Gesetz allein wirkt, ist eine halbe Buße oder ein Anfang der Buße oder eine Buße per synecdochen [stückweise]; denn sie hat keinen guten Vorsatz. — Ein guter Vorsatz, vermeinten sie, wäre ein selbsterwählter Gedanke, aus menschlichen Kräften die Sünde hinfort zu meiden, während er doch, nach dem Evangelio, eine Bewegung im Herzen ist, vom Heiligen Geist erweckt, die Sünde hinfort, aus [Gottes] Liebe zu hassen, obgleich indes die Sünde im Fleisch noch hart da wider kämpft. . . . Wider solche unnützen Lehrer der Verzweiflung sing das Evangelium an zu lehren, daß Buße nicht allein Verzweiflung sein müsse, sondern daß die Bußfertigen auch eine Hoffnung fassen sollen und also aus Liebe gegen Gott die Sünde hassen, was ein wahrhaft guter Vorsatz ist.“ (XX, 1629 f.) Es sei hier auch die ganze von Elert oben teilweise zitierte Stelle mitgeteilt: „Wenn ich aber anfangs zu glauben an Christum und fasse das Evangelium und zweifle nicht, daß er meine Sünde hat hinweggenommen und vertilgt, und tröste mich seiner Auf-
erstehung, da kommt denn eine Lust ins Herz, daß ich ohne Zwang und Drang von mir selbst zusahre und gerne tue, was ich soll, und spreche: Weil mein Herr mir solches getan hat, will ich auch tun, was er will, daß ich mich bessere und Buße tue, meinem Herrn zuliebe und zu Ehren. Da kommt eine rechte Besserung von, die da geht aus Grunde des Her-

zens und geschieht aus Lust, welche aus dem Glauben fließt, wenn ich erkenne, wie große Liebe Christus mir erzeigt hat." (XI, 693.) Hülsmann: „Reue und Glaube sind die wesentlichen Teile der Buße. Die Besserung des Lebens hingegen oder der neue Gehorsam oder die Erstötung der Begierden des Fleisches, sowohl die innere als auch die äußere Besserung, das heißt, sowohl der Vorsatz und Entschluß der Besserung als auch die Ausführung durch die Tat, gehört zum Fortgang der Buße.“ (*Praelectiones in Libr. Concordiae: De Poenit., sect. III.*) Gerhard: „Die vierte Frage ist, ob die Reue den Vorsatz, heilig zu leben, einschließt. . . . Antwort: Die heilsame Reue hat mit sich den Glauben verbunden, welcher die Quelle und das Fundament aller guten Werke ist. Aber wenn die Reue allein vorhanden ist, erweckt sie den Menschen nicht zur Hoffnung der Verzeihung und zum Vorsatz des neuen Lebens; sie schlägt ihn vielmehr zu Boden. Der wahre und gottgefällige Vorsatz des neuen Lebens kann nicht vorhanden sein außer in dem erneuerten Menschen; der wird aber nicht erneuert außer in der Wiedergeburt; die Wiedergeburt aber geschieht durch den Glauben, durch welchen die Herzen gereinigt werden, Apost. 15, 9. Niemand kann sich entschließen, ein heiliges und gottgefälliges Leben zu führen, wenn er nicht vorher gewiß ist, daß er mit Gott versöhnt ist.“ (*Locus de Poenit., § LXXXI.*) Konrad Dieterich: „Falsch sind folgende Lehren der Papisten . . . : wenn sie g) behaupten, daß die Reue den Vorsatz, recht zu handeln und zu leben, in sich schließe, während doch gerade dieser eine Folge der wahren Buße ist, ja sogar die eigentümliche und besondere Wirkung des Glaubens. Wie könnte es also der Reue zugeschrieben werden, welche doch das eine Stück der Buße ist und welche aus dem Geseß herkommt? Diese und andere grundlose Mönchseinsälle sind zu finden bei Bellarmin (I, 2, De Poenit., c. 2 et seq.).“ (*Inst. Cat., 175.*)

Hören wir etliche Zeugnisse aus unserer Zeit. M. Neu: „Die contritio impii besteht nur und kann nur bestehen in den Schrecken des Gewissens, dem Zer Schlagenerwerden durch Gottes richterlichen Zorn, dem sich der Mensch nicht zu entziehen vermag, so gerne er es auch wollte, und keineswegs auch schon in dem aufrichtigen Herzensschmerz, dem himmlischen Wohltäter also undankbar gewesen zu sein und ihn so tief beleidigt zu haben. Dies letzte Stück setzt vielmehr schon den durchs Evangelium gewirkten Glauben voraus. . . . Gerade unter ihm [dem Glauben] kommt es auch erst zu jenem innerlichen Zerriebenerwerden und Ersterben des alten Vorsatzes, der Liebe zum Sündigen; denn wie sollten Herzeleid über die Sünde und Vorsatz zu sündigen miteinander bestehen können? Erst durch den Glauben kann es nun zum Abscheu vor und zum Haß gegen die Sünde kommen, da man sie um ihrer selbst willen, wegen ihrer den Menschen befleckenden und ihn von Gott scheiden den Kraft, verabscheut und haßt.“ (*Die Heilsordnung, 16 f.*) *The Pastor's Monthly* (Jan. 1934, S. 32): „The fruit of Zacchaeus's repentance is brought forth at once. He who before had been an op-

pressor of the poor now becomes their friend and generous benefactor. . . . Zacchaeus burns his bridges behind him; once for all he turns his back upon his former life of sin. Here is true *metanoia*, a change of mind which involves inevitably a change of life as well. Here is peace and joy in the assurance of God's grace; and its genuineness is attested by the strength it gives to break the evil habits of a lifetime, to restore, to make good, as far as possible, every wrong committed."*) J. Meyer: "In repentance a sinner abandons the sinful thoughts and lusts and desires of his heart. . . . In repentance faith in our Savior is kindled in the heart. . . . The penitent has taken his stand against sin, having been united with his God in faith." (Jesus' Call to Repentance. Theol. Quartalschr., 26, 39 ff.) J. Bente: „Die vom Gesetz ohne gleichzeitige Handhabung des Evangeliums und vor dem Glauben gewirkte Sündenkenntnis und Reue ist von Bitterkeit, Zorn und Haß wider Gott und sein heiliges Gesetz durchtränkt. Sie ist nicht etwa der Anfang der Gotteskindschaft, sondern eine fleischliche, knechtische Reue, wie sie sich eben nur in einem untwiedergeborenen, Gott feindlichen Menschen finden kann und an welcher darum auch Gott kein herzliches Wohlgefallen zu haben vermag. . . . Geistlicher Art wird die Reue erst durch den Glauben. Kindliche, herzliche, willige und mit Liebe zu Gott verbundene Reue vermag das Gesetz nicht zu erzeugen. Sie spricht nur hervor, wenn Gott dem Gesetze das Evangelium hinzufügt und dem erschrockenen Sünder sein Gnadenantlitz leuchten läßt und durch den Glauben den Trost der Vergebung zuignet. . . . Ohne diesen Trost im Herzen ist die Traurigkeit, welche das Gesetz wirkt, eitel Verzagen, Verzweiflung, Hölle und Tod. . . . Bei allem Zurückschrecken vor der Sünde infolge der Flüche des Gesetzes dreht der unbefehrte Mensch immer noch Herz und Gesicht der Sünde und Gott den Rücken zu. Erst durch den Glauben entsteht jene kindliche Reue, jene innere Abneigung und Abkehr von der Sünde und jene Willigkeit zum Guten, da der Mensch nicht rückwärtsgehend nur äußerlich vor der bösen Tat zurückschreckt, sondern der Sünde den Rücken zugehrt, vor ihr flieht und Herz, Sinn und Mut zu Gott hinwendet und dem Guten nachjagt.“ (Lehre u. Behre, 63, 274 ff.)

Wird der gute Voratz durch die Forderung und Drohung des Gesetzes hervorgerufen, oder ist er ausschließlich die Wirkung des Evangeliums, die Folge des Glaubens? Die lutherische Lehre über diesen Punkt kommt zum adäquaten Ausdruck in der uns bekannten Formel,

*) Wie oft wird diese von Zachäus geleistete Wiedererstattung, die eine Frucht des Glaubens war, auf einen vor dem Glauben eingetretenen Gefinnungswechsel zurückgeführt! "There must be, as in the case of the publican, honest, heartfelt humiliation before God, which exhibits itself in its sincerity through actual deeds of restitution when the wrong can be partly righted. Zacchaeus exemplified his repentance through deeds of righting the wrong. . . . Repentance leads to faith." (J. Haas, *The Truth of Faith*, S. 109 f.)

die nicht neueren Ursprungs ist, sondern wesentlich aus der altlutherischen Zeit stammt: „Ist das euer aller aufrichtiges Bekenntniß, daß ihr eure Sünden herzlich bereuet, an Jesum Christum glaubet und den guten, ernstlichen Vorfaß habt, durch Beistand Gottes des Heiligen Geistes euer sündhaftes Leben forthin zu bessern, so bezeuget es mit einem lauten Ja!“ (Schluß folgt.) L. H. Engelder.

The Catechism in the Christian Home.

Luther and his faithful colaborers in the work of Reformation owed their success, next to the grace of God, to the fact that they used the only means whereby a reformation of the Church could possibly be effected, the preaching of the pure and unadulterated Word of God in simple, straightforward manner. The simple truths of the Catechism, those basic facts laid down in the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, were reintroduced by these men of God into church and home and school. Luther insisted that the truths of the Catechism, nothing more, but also nothing less, be preached in every public service. In order to teach the Catechism to the people, he inaugurated special series of sermons on week-days or during the so-called Catechism seasons, in the spring and the fall of the year, and introduced the custom of a public recital of the Catechism by the children in public worship. Helpful and beneficial though these efforts proved to be, Luther readily perceived the necessity of enlisting the Christian home in the noble work of teaching and indoctrinating young and old in the fundamentals of the Christian religion. And not a little of the marvelous success of the Reformation is to be ascribed to the untiring efforts of Luther and his assistants to make use of the opportunities which the home afforded in teaching the Catechism, to remind Christian parents of their solemn obligation to their children, to the Church, and to their God and Savior, to provide the parents with proper educational material for the Christian training of their children and the other members of their household. A brief review of these efforts will not only prove interesting reading, but will stimulate renewed interest in this phase of a Lutheran pastor's work and give him a livelier sense of his duties and obligations in this respect.

As early as 1519, in his sermon on the Gospel for the Second Sunday after Epiphany, Luther told his congregation some truths which hold good to this day and which every pastor ought to tell his people time and again. He says: "Married people should know that they can do no better work and be of no greater benefit to God, to Christendom, to the world, to themselves and to their children than by training their children well. To make pilgrimages to Rome, to

Jerusalem, to St. James, to build churches, to pay for masses, or what other work may be named, is nothing compared with this one work, that married folk train their children. . . . Again, hell is not more easily earned than by one's attitude toward one's own children. Neither may a more harmful work be done than that of neglecting children, permitting them to curse, swear, learn shameful words and songs, and living according to their own will. . . . There is no greater harm to Christendom than neglecting the children. For if Christendom is to be helped, one must forsooth begin with the children, as was done in former times. For this reason it is necessary that every married person regard his child in a more thorough, deeper, and more diligent manner than merely as that flesh which has issued from him. Rather should he regard his child no less than as a precious, eternal treasure, which God has entrusted to him to keep it, so that the devil, the world, and the flesh may not steal or kill it." (St. L., X, 643 f.)

From this passage we gather that, when Luther preached to his congregation, he was interested in the welfare not only of the adults, but of the children as well. And when he later had his sermons on the various parts of the Catechism printed and published, he again did this not merely with the intention of giving the older members of his congregation an opportunity to read and study and ponder them. It was his purpose that what they had well learned they should teach to their children, so that they also might grow in the knowledge of the Word and will of their God and Savior. This purpose was well served by the custom of those days of having brief summaries of the Christian doctrine printed on charts or placards that were hung on the walls of the home or attached to the doors or the covers of the large family chests. Such charts, or tables, were sure to rouse the curiosity of the children, cause them to ask questions, and thus offer to the parents an opportunity, yes, almost force them, to make some explanation of, give some instruction on, the contents of these tables. It seems that Luther's *Kurze Auslegung der Zehn Gebote Gottes* (*Brief Exposition of the Ten Commandments of God*), first published during Lent of 1518, was originally printed in the form of charts. (Cohrs, *Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche*, p. 1, quoting the Weimar edition, I, 248.) Hence, when Luther preached his sermon on the Second Sunday after Epiphany, 1519, he may have had in mind just these charts of his as an aid to be used by the parents in instructing their children. In 1519 he also published his *Kurze Form, das Paternoster zu verstehen und zu beten, fuer die jungen Kinder im Christenglauben*. In the introduction he explains this term as including "all who are so simple that they do not know what the words of the Lord's Prayer comprise or what they ask for, wherefore they speak the words coldly, carelessly, without due reverence." Still a man who could preach like Luther on that Second Sunday after

Epiphany certainly did not mean to exclude children from the number of those to whom this booklet was dedicated.

Nor did Luther change his view in later years. In his masterly dissertation on the order of worship, his *Deutsche Messe*, 1526, he, in connection with the teaching of the Catechism in public worship, devoted several paragraphs to the duty of parents to teach the Catechism at home. We quote from Holman's translation:—

"Let us to it in God's name. First, the German service needs an easily understood, plain, simple catechism. Catechism means instruction, in which heathen who want to be Christians are taught and directed in what they should believe, do, omit to do, and know in the Christian religion. For this reason beginners who were admitted to such instruction and studied the Creed before they were baptized were called *catechumeni*. This instruction, or direction, I know not how to put in a clearer or better way than has been done since the beginning of Christendom and retained to our own day, namely, in these three, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Our Father. These three contain, simply and briefly, about everything a Christian needs to know. This instruction must be given, as long as there is no special congregation, from the pulpit at stated times or daily, as may be needed, and repeated or read aloud evenings and mornings in the homes for the children and the servants if we want to train them as Christians. They should not merely learn to say the words by heart, as heretofore, but with each part they should be asked questions and give answer what each part means and how they understand it. If everything cannot be covered at once, one part should be taken up and the next day another. For if the parents and guardians of youth will not take the pains to do this themselves or secure others to do it, there will never be a catechism, unless it should come to pass that separate congregations were organized, as stated above.

"They should be questioned like this: What do you pray? Answer: The Our Father. What does it mean when you say, 'Our Father in heaven?' Answer: That God is not an earthly, but a heavenly Father, who would make us rich and blessed in heaven. What does this mean: 'Hallowed be Thy name?' Answer: That we should honor His name and keep it from being profaned. How is His name dishonored and profaned? Answer: When we who should be His children live evil lives and teach and believe what is wrong. And so on, what the kingdom of God means; how it comes; what God's will is; what daily bread means; etc.

"So in the Creed: What do you believe? Answer: 'I believe in God the Father,' to the end. Thereafter one part after the other as time permits, one part or two at once. For instance, What does it mean to believe in God the Father Almighty? Answer: It means to

trust in Him with all the heart and with assurance to expect all grace, favor, help, and comfort from Him in time and in eternity. What does it mean to believe in Jesus Christ, His Son? Answer: It means to believe in the heart that we should all be eternally lost if Christ had not died for us, etc.

"Likewise in the Ten Commandments. One must ask, What does the First Commandment mean, the Second, the Third, and the other commandments? These questions can be taken from our *Betbuechlein*, where the three chief parts are briefly explained, or one may follow his own method, until all Christian teaching is summed up for the heart in two portions, two pouches, as it were, which are faith and love. Faith's pouch may have two purses. Into the one we put this, that we believe that through the sin of Adam we are all corrupt, sinners, and under condemnation, Rom. 5, Ps. 51. Into the other purse we put this, that we are all saved through Jesus Christ from such corruption, sin, and condemnation, Rom. 5, John 3. Love's pouch may also have two purses. One shall contain this, that we should serve and do good to every one, even as Christ hath done for us, Rom. 13; the other shall have this, that we should suffer and endure all kinds of evil with joy.

"When a child begins to understand this, it should be encouraged to bring home Scripture-texts from the sermons and repeat them at meal-time for the parents, as was formerly the custom with the Latin lesson. Then those texts should be put into the pouches and purses just as the *Pfennige*, *Groschen*, or *Gulden* are put into the pockets. For instance, let faith's pouch be the golden pouch. Into the first purse this text shall go, Rom. 5: Through one man's sin all men are sinners and have passed under condemnation. Also this one, Ps. 51: Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. These are two Rhenish *Gulden* for this purse. The Hungarian *Gulden* go into the other purse, as this text, Rom. 4: Christ was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised again for our justification. Again, John 1: Behold the Lamb of God, which beareth the sin of the world. These are two precious Hungarian *Gulden* for that purse.

"Let love's pouch be the silver pouch. Into the first purse shall go the texts concerning well-doing, such as Gal. 5: Through love be servants one to another; Matt. 25: What ye have done unto one of the least of these My brethren ye have done unto Me. They would be two silver *Groschen* for that purse. Into the other purse shall go this text, Matt. 5: Blessed are ye when men shall persecute you for My sake; Heb. 12: Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth. These are two *Schreckenberger* for that purse.

"Let none think himself too wise for this and despise such child's

play. Christ, in order to train men, must needs become a man Himself. If we wish to train children, we must become children with them. Would to God such child's play were widely practised! In a short time we would have a wealth of Christian people, who would be rich in Scripture and the knowledge of God, until they would of their own accord add more of such purses as *locos communes* and comprehend all Scripture in them. Otherwise things will remain as they have been, a daily going to church and a coming away again. For no one thinks that it makes any difference, except for the time it takes. No one expects to learn anything there. A man listens to preaching three or four years and does not learn enough to give answer concerning one article of the Creed; this I know from daily experience. Enough is written in the books, yes; but it has not been driven home to the hearts." (*Works of Martin Luther*, VI, 174 ff.)

When in January, 1529, Luther first published his Small Catechism, he had it printed in chart form, each chart, or table, bearing the superscription "As the head of the family should teach it in all simplicity to his household." While the first chart editions of January and March, 1529, are no longer extant, a copy written by Pastor Michael Stiefel of Lochau has been found in recent years, which contains the superscription over every chief part. This superscription is also found in Bugenhagen's Low-German translation, which was published before Luther's Catechism in book form was put on the market. While there are no more copies of the first edition of Luther's Catechism in book form, the three early reprints, two at Erfurt, one at Marburg, have the superscription over the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, Lord's Supper, while in the First Chief Part it was crowded out by the new title, *Ein kleiner Catechismus oder christliche Zucht*. The book is dedicated to the pastors and preachers, who in the preface were admonished to urge the parents to train their children, "showing them their duty in this regard and the greatness of their sin if they neglect it." (*Triglotta*, p. 537, § 19.) To the end of his life Luther did not tire in his efforts to make the homes truly Christian homes, in which the children and all the members of the household were to be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Neither did he tire in exhorting pastors and preachers to keep on urging their people to train their household in the fear and love of God.

In these efforts Luther was ably assisted by his coworkers. The *Kirchenordnung* for Hamburg, written by Bugenhagen and adopted in May, 1529, refers in its preface to the Low-German translation of the Catechism as to a "form in which a housefather and housemother (who are bishops in their home) shall instruct the children and household in the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, Lord's Supper, and how they shall read the *Benedicite* and *Gratias* at table. If such Christian practise is displeasing

to any one, he has also forgotten what is right and equitable." (Reu. Quellen, I, III, 1, p. 574.)*)

Melanchthon had published an *Enchiridion* as early as 1523, to be used in his *schola privata* and hence written in Latin. In the very same year a German edition was published by an unknown translator, who dedicated his translation to *the parents* and urged them to use it as a guide-book in the instruction of their children at home. This dedication deserves to be better known, and hence we shall offer it to our readers:—

"To all parents God's grace and peace. Amen. Dear brethren and sisters in Christ. You undoubtedly are aware to what an extent the common schools are partly deteriorating, partly even already closed, for no other reason than that by the grace of God in these gracious times of the Holy Gospel of God you have come to the understanding that the so-called spiritual order (*die vermaindt gaystligkayt*) is before God no greater, more meritorious, nor salutary order than that of the lowliest laborer or peasant, just as though no one should learn or know the Scriptures of God except the so-called priests, monks, and nuns. Therefore our beloved brother in the Lord Philip Melanchthon in Christian love has recently compiled the present book and had dedicated it to all your children. With the aid of God I have undertaken to translate this book into our German language, with the good intention that from it you, together with your children, may the better learn what to do or not to do. Hence this is my sincere and faithful request that you would faithfully consider and diligently teach to your children the said faithful, Christian, pious instruction of Melanchthon and accustom them as children to the doctrine and Scripture, especially in view of the fact that through the divine Holy Scripture we must seek and find Christ. For these are the swaddling-clothes into which Christ Jesus, our pious Lord and Savior, was wrapped by His dear mother, the Virgin Mary. This is the very temple of God in which Christ in His twelfth year was again found sitting in the midst of the doctors, Luke 2. This is the real true holy sepulcher, which through the Jews, that is, through false prophets and deceiving teachers, has for so many centuries been guarded, yea, suppressed by human laws, opinions, and so-called worship that Christ with His holy, gracious Gospel might never again rise for us poor human beings. Your children may nevertheless learn some trade or other Christian occupation in order to earn their living in an honest, good, and Christian manner. Else if only priests, monks, and nuns were to learn, know, and teach the Scriptures, they would tear the living Word of God out of our mouths and hearts just as surely as it has been done for several centuries. Therefore consider for God's sake that Christ so diligently urges and directs us to search Holy Scripture when he tells the Jews: John 5, 39. 40. Therefore

gladly receive as a New Year's wish this kind admonition in Christ Jesus and never forget the advice of our dear brother Melancthon, yea, of our Lord and Savior Christ, always keeping in mind the passage from the living, eternal Word of God found Prov. 8, 35. — Given on Saturday, the Day of Stephen, the first martyr, A. D. 1524"* (1523 our style, since in the age of the Reformation the new year began on Christmas Day).

Bugenhagen, preaching to his congregation in Wittenberg, 1532, referred to the chief parts of the Catechism and continued: "To this state [to live according to these chief parts] you fathers and mothers must accustom your children and household, so that they may know and understand them, *lest our public preaching be useless*. For you are the bishops in your homes; that [duty] you cannot escape. For the training of the young in the discipline of the Lord is a great and arduous matter. If pious parents have properly educated one son or daughter, a pious progeny will be established, and from such progeny good will result to the whole world, both to the Church and to the State. So great a blessing can issue forth from so humble an origin, from the instruction of a pious father and mother."

Spangenberg, in his introduction to his catechism to be used at Nordhausen, writes as follows: "What is this Christian doctrine called? Are these parts necessary? Who shall put these questions? Every housefather shall accustom his children, when they arise in the morning, when they go to the table, when they go to sleep at night, to recite these parts one after another, in good orderly manner, and shall not give them food or drink unless they have recited them. In like manner masters and mistresses shall inquire at least once a week of their household, servants and maids, what they know or learn of these matters; and if they do not want to know or learn them, they should not keep them in their service." (Reu, I, 2, p. 224.)*

Moerlin's second edition of *Luther's Catechism Explained*, published 1562, gives practical hints to the parents, advising them first to teach their children "*den reinen Text*," the simple text, *i. e.*, the texts of the five chief parts without Luther's explanation; then the explanation; finally, after this has been done, they shall, "in the present or some other form further explain to their children the rich meaning according to God's Word"; also practise Catechism hymns with their children. (Reu, I, 3, 1, p. 891.)*

The *Order for Hessa*, adopted 1566, prescribed special sermons on the Catechism and a thorough instruction in the chief parts on Sunday and specified week-days, with the remark added that "by this method it could be ascertained whether the parents exercise the proper diligence and seriousness in instructing their children in the Catechism at home." (Reu, I, 2, p. 425.)*

Such quotations could easily be multiplied; but these will suffice

to show that during the age of the Reformation, pastors were alive to their duty of reminding parents of their solemn obligation to bring up their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord by training them at home and teaching them the Small Catechism.

Last year there issued from the pen of the well-known Marburg catechete Dr. Karl Bornhaeuser a booklet entitled *Der Ursinn des Kleinen Katechismus* (The Real Meaning of Luther's Small Catechism). Bornhaeuser shows that Luther's Catechism was originally intended chiefly for the Christian home. He dedicated his book to all evangelical housefathers and pleaded with them to make their homes truly Christian educational centers by teaching Luther's Catechism to their household. We quote: "The home, after the heart of Luther, is not a silent home, as so many Christian homes of our day are . . . and unfortunately even such homes whose members claim to be Christians and would resent the charge of belonging to the opponents of 'religion.' When are the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, or the words of institution of Baptism and the Lord's Supper once heard in these homes? That may happen if one of the children goes to school and must learn them for the course in religion and mother must see to it that the child knows the lesson given it. Perhaps the mother will sigh because so much memory work is demanded by the school and by her attitude create unwillingness in the child. Where are morning and evening devotions or prayer at table regarded as a self-evident custom? And where are they conducted in the manner suggested by Luther? In the days when people followed Luther's advice, the Lord's Prayer was prayed, and prayed aloud, by individuals and by the whole family. That was done at least five times a day, so frequently that we Christians of to-day, sluggish as we are in prayer, would be tempted to say that that was almost too much of a good thing; perhaps we would even regard it as a 'Catholic' custom, approaching the abuse of the Lord's Prayer in the rosary. Twice a day the Creed was to be spoken. Is not in our day the Creed relegated to public worship and religious instruction, so that it is heard in the homes only on the occasion of private baptisms? And the Ten Commandments, when are they ever uttered in our homes except in connection with school-work? Even in public worship they are no longer heard. And especially Christ's words of institution of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Does one call them to mind, does one speak of them and about them prior to baptisms and partaking of the Lord's Supper? Is it surprising under such conditions that there are to-day many who are called Christians, who demand that they be called so, and who in spite of school and confirmation instruction soon do not even remember them [these chief parts of the Catechism] exactly, much less have the 'sense' of them? . . . But if they would hear the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Commandments daily or almost daily, the exact wording would soon be impressed upon

their minds, and impressed so surely and indelibly that they could never forget it, and that without the disagreeable task of memorizing." (Pp. 19. 20.)

Does this description not fit many a home in our own circles? What are we pastors doing to remedy this sad situation?

In a different connection Bornhaeuser says: "Untold havoc has been wrought by making the school, . . . as is done so often, the substitute for the home in religious instruction. In the task of aiding the coming generation to become Christians (and not merely 'religious'), there dare not and there cannot be a substitute for the home. . . . No one was more firmly convinced of the indispensable and unsurpassable importance of the home with its living associations for becoming and remaining a Christian than Luther, whom certainly no one can charge with underestimating the school. Even the preacher of the Gospel cannot take the place of the home and its influence nor render it superfluous." (P. 163 f.)

We close with Luther's plea, addressed to all pastors in the preface of his Small Catechism: "Especially should you here urge civil rulers and parents to govern well and educate children for service in schools, showing them their duty in this regard and the greatness of their sin if they neglect it; for by such neglect they overthrow and destroy both the kingdom of God and that of this world and show themselves to be the worst foes both of God and man. Dwell on the great harm they do if they will not help to educate children for the ministry, clerkships, and other offices, etc., and on the terrible punishment God will visit upon them for it. It is necessary to preach of these things; for parents and rulers sin unspeakably in them, and the devil has a horrible object in view."

T. LAETSCH.

Der Gottesdienst in der alten Kirche.

Wenn David Ps. 27, 4 von „den schönen Gottesdiensten des Herrn“ redet, bezieht er sich ohne Zweifel auf die öffentlichen Versammlungen, die nach Gottes Ordnung in der Stiftshütte abgehalten wurden, zunächst in Verbindung mit dem Morgen- und Abendopfer, dann aber besonders bei Gelegenheit der großen Feste, namentlich des Passahfestes, des Pfingstfestes, des Laubbüttenfestes und des großen Versöhnungstages. Alle diese Gottesdienste waren wesentlich Opfergottesdienste, nicht nur, weil in ihnen das Opfern verschiedener Tiere die Hauptsache bildete, sondern auch, weil die sakrifizielle Seite dieser Gottesdienste in Psalmen und Gebeten besonders stark hervortrat. Allerdings hatte der Gesangsvortrag gewisser Psalmen durch den Tempelchor auch eine sakramentale Seite, da durch diese inspirierten Gesänge eine Belehrung der Gemeinde erzielt wurde; aber diese Seite des Gottesdienstes trat in der Regel sehr gegen den Opferkultus zurück.

Die Gestalt des Tempelgottesdienstes blieb von der Zeit Moses bis zur Zerstörung des salomonischen Tempels durch Nebukadnezar und später von der Rückkehr der Exulanten unter Serubabel und Josua bis zur endlichen Zerstörung des herodianischen Tempels wesentlich dieselbe, abgesehen von der Einführung gewisser Lieder und Zeremonien in Verbindung mit den großen Festen, wie uns das nach dem Exil wiederholt entgegentritt. Aber eben in der nachexilischen Zeit finden wir eine neue Einrichtung, den Synagogengottesdienst, und dieser hat allerdings eine Form, die auch der sakramentalen Seite des Gottesdienstes Rechnung trägt. Weil die Synagogen jedenfalls während des Exils aufstamen, als der Tempel in Trümmern lag, war es notwendig, daß die Gemeinde Belehrung aus Gottes Wort erhalte, und demgemäß gestaltete sich der Synagogengottesdienst. Er enthielt die folgenden Teile: 1. zwei Gebete; 2. Sch'ma; 3. Gebet; 4. Dankfagungen und Segen; 5. letzte Dankfagung; 6. Verlesen des Gesetzes und der Propheten; 7. Ansprache oder Predigt; 8. kurzes Schlußgebet. Der erste Teil dieses Gottesdienstes war fast ausschließlich sakrifiziell, der zweite dagegen fast gänzlich sakramental. Dies war die Form des Gottesdienstes, die in den Synagogen zur Zeit Jesu (Luk. 4, 16 ff.) und des Apostels Paulus (Apost. 13, 14 ff.) gebräuchlich war.

Die erste Christengemeinde war vorwiegend jüdisch, wenn sich auch viele Hellenisten, das heißt, hellenistische Juden, in Jerusalem fanden, wie das die Geschichte Apost. 6 zeigt. Wir können darum mit Recht erwarten, daß sich der Einfluß der gewohnten Gottesdienstordnung in der frühesten Liturgie bemerkbar machen würde. Und das ist allerdings der Fall. Es ist aber nicht der Opfergottesdienst des Tempels, der als Vorbild für die christliche Feier genommen wurde, sondern der Lehr- oder Predigtgottesdienst der Synagoge. Das Neue Testament zeigt nämlich ganz klar, daß die Hauptelemente des urchristlichen Gottesdienstes die Lehre, das Brotbrechen (das Abendmahl) und das Gebet waren. Und hierbei ist die Lehre das Hauptelement nicht nur in den öffentlichen oder Missionsgottesdiensten, sondern auch in den privaten, in den Hausgottesdiensten.

Die Lehre, die Predigt, war Hauptsache in den Gottesdiensten der apostolischen Kirche. Dies stand im Einklang mit Gottes Befehl und Ordnung. Christus hat seinen Jüngern, seinen Aposteln, befohlen zu predigen. Er ordnete die Zwölf, daß er sie aussendete, zu predigen, Mark. 3, 14. Sein großer Befehl an die Kirche aller Zeiten ist: „Prediget das Evangelium aller Kreatur!“ Mark. 16, 15. Petrus bezeugt in Cäsarea: „Er [Christus] hat uns geboten, zu predigen dem Volk“, Apost. 10, 42. Paulus schreibt: „Christus hat mich gesandt, das Evangelium zu predigen“, 1 Kor. 1, 17. In ca. 150 Stellen des Neuen Testaments wird gerade das Predigen als die wesentliche Tätigkeit der apostolischen Kirche dargestellt. Und die Predigt der ersten Kirche war Lehrpredigt, nicht nur nach dem Beispiel, sondern auch besonders nach dem Befehl Christi. Apost. 2, 42 wird von

der Gemeinde zu Jerusalem ausdrücklich bezeugt: „Sie blieben beständig in der Apostel Lehre.“ Dies zieht sich durch alle Bücher des Neuen Testaments hindurch, wie das jede Konfession zur Genüge nachweisen kann.

Die Predigtgottesdienste der Gemeinde zu Jerusalem lassen sich einteilen in öffentliche oder Tempelgottesdienste und in Hausgottesdienste. Wir lesen von den Aposteln: „Sie hörten nicht auf, alle Tage im Tempel und hin und her in Häusern zu lehren und zu predigen das Evangelium von Jesu Christo“, Apost. 5, 42. Die Gläubigen in Jerusalem betätigten sich demnach als Christengemeinde, die durch diese Gottesdienste in den Hallen des Tempels ihren Missionsberuf unter Israel ausübte. „Dieser Teil ihrer gottesdienstlichen Selbstbetätigung war der überwiegend exoterische, missionierende, dessen Hauptelement darum auch die Verkündigung des Wortes bildete.“ (Harnack, Der christliche Gemeindegottesdienst, 100.)

Nicht nur aber in diesen Gottesdiensten im Tempel wurde das Evangelium gepredigt, wie Apost. 5, 42 so deutlich bezeugt, sondern auch in den Hausgottesdiensten, wenn wir auch von vornherein annehmen können, daß diese mehr dem inneren Aufbau der Gemeinde dienten. Dies scheint klar aus Apost. 2, 42. 46 hervorzugehen, wo die Hausgottesdienste mit dem Brechen des Brotes in Verbindung gebracht werden. Harnack schreibt: „Von dem ersten Moment ihres Daseins an hatte die jerusalemische Gemeinde ein bestimmtes Bewußtsein von ihrer spezifischen Christengemeinschaft. Dasselbe bestand zwar nicht neben, sondern in ihrem israelitischen Verbande, war aber doch stark genug und auch so konkret ausgeprägt, daß es imstande war, jener drohenden Judaifizierung des Christentums gegenüber das volle Gegengewicht zu bilden. Das ist die große und gewichtige Bedeutung jener uranfänglichen engeren Zusammenkünfte *κατ' οίκον*, in denen die Christen sich als eine von Israel gesonderte und in sich geschlossene Gemeinde von Bekennern Christi betätigten.“ (S. 103.) Daß dies auch in andern Gemeinden der apostolischen Zeit der Fall war, ergibt sich aus Apost. 20, 7. 11, wo erzählt wird: „Da die Jünger zusammenkamen, das Brot zu brechen, predigte ihnen Paulus . . . und zog die Rede hin bis zu Mitternacht.“ Demnach waren auch die Gemeindegottesdienste in den Häusern nicht bloße Feiern des Abendmahls und der Agape, sondern vorzugsweise Lehrgottesdienste, allerdings mit Feier des heiligen Abendmahls, wie weiter unten ausgeführt werden soll. Die Lehre, die *διδασκία τῶν ἀποστόλων*, war das verbindende Glied in den Versammlungen beider Art. In den Missionsgottesdiensten, ob zu Jerusalem im Tempel oder im syrischen Antiochien und in Korinth in einer Synagoge, resp. in einer Rhetorenschule, hatte man hauptsächlich den Zweck der Belehrung Israels mit der Richtung auf die Taufe, während die eigentlichen Gemeindegottesdienste in den Häusern der weiteren Erkenntnis und der Ermunterung in den allerheiligsten Wahrheiten und Hoffnungen des Glaubens dienten. In den Missionsgottes-

diensten war die Predigt eine *μαρτυρία* oder *εὐαγγελία*; in den Hausgottesdiensten aber hatte sie mehr den Charakter des *διδάσκειν*, *διαλέγεσθαι*, *ὁμιλεῖν*, und diente zur Begleitung und Erläuterung der sakramentalen Feier. Vgl. Apost. 2, 42. In diesem Sinne haben wir auch Hebr. 10, 25 zu verstehen: „Lasset uns nicht verlassen unsere Versammlung (*ἐπισυναγωγή*), wie etliche pflegen.“ Keine Stelle des Neuen Testaments berechtigt uns zu dem Schluß, daß das Abendmahl als selbständiger Kultusakt den Gipfelpunkt des frühchristlichen Gottesdienstes gebildet hätte. Die Predigt, die Belehrung der Gemeinde durch das Wort Gottes, war der Mittelpunkt, der Kern, des apostolischen Gottesdienstes; der sakramentale Akt des Redens Gottes mit den Gläubigen war die Hauptsache, um die sich alles andere drehte.

Aber die Antwort der Gemeinde in sakrifiziellen Akten war ebenso von vornherein ein wesentlicher Bestandteil des Gottesdienstes. Die Haupttätigkeit in diesem Teil des Gottesdienstes war die des öffentlichen Gebetes, sowohl des gesprochenen wie des gesungenen Gebetes, letzteres in der Gestalt von Psalmen, Lobgesängen und geistlichen lieblichen Liedern. Bekannt ist die Stelle Kol. 3, 16: „Lasset das Wort Christi unter euch reichlich wohnen in aller Weisheit; lehret und vermahnet euch selbst mit Psalmen und Lobgesängen und geistlichen lieblichen Liedern.“ Fast genau dieselben Worte finden sich in dem etwa zur selben Zeit geschriebenen Brief an die Epheser: „Redet untereinander von Psalmen und Lobgesängen und geistlichen Liedern.“ Und was das gesprochene oder rezitierte öffentliche Gebet anlangt, so haben wir in dem Passus 1 Tim. 2, 1—8 ganz klar eine Bezugnahme auf den öffentlichen Gottesdienst, wie das auch die altchristlichen Ausleger mit großer Einstimmigkeit anerkannt haben. Die Sitte des Gemeindegebets ist schon beschrieben in Apost. 4, 24, tritt aber ganz besonders deutlich hervor in Kap. 2, 42. Es unterliegt keinem Zweifel, daß die ersten Gemeinden bei ihren Gottesdiensten Gebete sprachen oder rezitierten, daß sie Psalmen, Lobgesänge und geistliche liebliche Lieder sangen. Es wird auch von angesehenen Liturgiologen nicht mit Unrecht, wie es scheint, behauptet, daß wenigstens einige der neutestamentlichen Dogologien christliche Hymnen waren, wie z. B. Eph. 5, 14; 1 Tim. 3, 16; 6, 15. 16; 2 Tim. 2, 11—13; Offenb. 1, 4—8; 5, 9—14; 21, 10—14; 22, 17. Hierher gehört auch die Stelle aus den Briefen des Plinius Secundus (Ep. 96), worin er erwähnt, daß die Christen die Gewohnheit hatten, stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem, womit jedenfalls Gebete, Dogologien und Gesänge gemeint sind, und zwar auch solche, die antiphonisch rezitiert oder gesungen wurden. Harnack bemerkt hierzu: „Die Vortragsweise der Psalmen und Gebete war teils die des reinen strophischen und antistrophischen Wechselgesangs zwischen zwei Gemeindegliedern oder auch zwischen dem Vorsänger und der Gemeinde; teils sprach oder sang der erstere ein Gebet oder einen Psalm vor, und die ganze Gemeinde wiederholte entweder zwischeneinfallend

die letzten Worte, oder sie antwortete schließlich mit einer bestimmten Schlußformel, sei es mit einer Dogologie oder dem einfachen Amen.“ (S. 223 f.) Hierüber findet sich in den alten Kirchenvätern so viel, daß die Belege mehr als genügen sollten.

Zu den Elementen des altkirchlichen Gottesdienstes müssen wir aber auch noch, laut der Stelle Apost. 2, 42 ff. und vieler Berichte in andern Büchern des Neuen Testaments und der apostolischen Väter, die Gemeinschaft und das Brotbrechen rechnen. Wir beschränken dabei die *κοινωνία* allerdings nicht auf den öffentlichen Gottesdienst — denn dem steht der Kontext an der genannten Stelle entgegen, der die Urgemeinde nach ihrer äußerlich erkennbaren und tätigen Erscheinung überhaupt schildern will —; aber es ist klar, daß sich das Wort auch mit auf die Versammlungen der Gemeinde bezieht. Die *κοινωνία* verband die ersten Christen in brüderlicher Gleichheit und Gemeinschaft, so daß gerade durch sie die Tatsache des allgemeinen Priestertums zur Geltung kam. Weil in der ersten Kirche alle Gläubigen, Reiche und Arme, Vornehme und Geringe, Hohe und Niedrige, auf einer Stufe standen, so zeigte sich auch die Gemeinschaft des Glaubens und der Liebe in dem gegenseitigen Einanderdienen in der Liebe sowohl wie in dem gemeinsamen Gott dienen. Und darum kann das Brotbrechen in Apost. 2, 46, das an einigen Stellen allerdings nur von einer gewöhnlichen Mahlzeit zu verstehen ist (Matth. 14, 19; Luk. 24, 30. 35; Apost. 27, 35), kaum anders als von einer spezifisch christlichen Handlung verstanden werden, durch die sich die Christen in ganz besonderer Weise als solche erwiesen und im Unterschied von der Gemeinde Israels ihre Brudergemeinschaft untereinander besonders betätigten. Es geht darum nicht an, das Brotbrechen auf die mit der heiligen Abendmahls handlung verbundene gemeinschaftliche Mahlzeit zu beschränken (Juda 12; 2 Petr. 2, 13; 1 Kor. 11, 17 ff.), die später unter dem Namen Agape bekannt war. Selbst Harnack muß zugestehen, daß das Brotbrechen auf das innigste mit der Abendmahlsfeier zusammenhängt und nur in Verbindung mit ihr Geltung und Wert hat. Mit andern Worten, es scheint festzustehen, daß wenigstens in der ersten Zeit das gemeinschaftliche Brotbrechen so unzertrennlich mit dem Abendmahl verbunden war, daß der Terminus selber direkt auf die Abendmahlsfeier anwendbar war und auch so im Gebrauch stand.

Somit hätten wir drei Hauptelemente des urchristlichen Gemeindegottesdienstes: die Lehre, das Brotbrechen oder das Abendmahl und das Gebet in seinen verschiedenen Arten. Wie steht es nun aber mit der **Form** des altkirchlichen Gottesdienstes?

Hier sehen wir uns genötigt, Zeugen außerhalb der Schrift hinzuzuziehen, da in keinem Buche des Neuen Testaments der altkirchliche Gottesdienst im Zusammenhang geschildert wird. Unser ältester Zeuge ist Clemens Romanus in seinem (ersten) Brief an die Korinther, besonders in Kap. 40 und 59—61. Da lesen wir: „Diejenigen also, welche zu den festgesetzten Zeiten ihre Opfergaben bringen, sind an-

genehm und gesegnet; denn wer den Satzungen des Herrn folgt, kann nicht irgehen. Dem Hohenpriester sind seine eigenen liturgischen Dienste übertragen, den Priestern ihr eigener Wirkungskreis gesteckt, und auch den Leviten obliegen eigene Dienstleistungen; der Laie endlich ist durch die Laiengebote gebunden.“ Das heißt nach dem Zusammenhang, wie Kliefoth zeigt (Liturgische Abhandlungen, I, 271—273): „Die Darbringung der Gebete und Gaben [ist] allerdings recht das neutestamentliche Priestergeschäft. Freilich gehört dies Priestertum und Priestergeschäft allen Christen zu, und die Presbyter und Diakonen können dabei nur im Namen und anstatt der Gemeinde handeln. Aber diesen Satz leugnet auch Clemens nicht entfernt, sondern er behauptet nur, daß bei dieser Erweisung des allgemeinen Priestertums der Ordnung wegen jeder in seiner *τάξις*, an seinem Orte, zu bleiben habe. Er argumentiert so: Die ganze Gemeinde ist die Priesterin und hat durch ihren Hohenpriester Jesus die Opfer ihrer Gebete und Gaben darzubringen; dazu aber bedarf sie eines Dienstes, einer *leitourgia*; und dieser Dienst, wie er im Alten Testament den Priestern und Leviten zukam, kommt jetzt den Presbytern und Diakonen zu, welche die von dem Herrn erwählten Apostel entweder unmittelbar oder mittelbar eingesetzt haben. Und bei dieser Anschauung ist die Kirche so lange geblieben, als sie festhielt, daß die Opfer der Christen in Gebet und Gaben, im Opfer der Frucht der Lippen und der Werke, beständen: die Gemeinde ist ein Volk von Priestern und hat als solches Gebete und Gaben zu opfern; dabei braucht sie allerdings eines Mittlers, aber dieser Mittler ist allein Christus, ‚der Hohenpriester unserer Opfer‘, als in welchem allein wir Gebete und gute Werke zu Gottes Wohlgefallen tun können; auch braucht sie dabei Diener, welche vordeten, und dieser Dienst kommt den Presbytern zu, weil sie im übrigen die *ὑπομένοντες* der Gemeinde sind; aber dieser Dienst ist kein Mittlertum, sondern eben ein Dienst, ein ministerium, eine *leitourgia*. Diese Anschauungen ändern sich erst, als die Vorstellung aufkommt, daß man nicht Gebete und Gaben, sondern den Leib des Herrn opfere.“ Wie Clemens aber so von einem geordneten Dienst redet, so weisen die von ihm angeführten Gebete auf liturgischen Gebrauch hin, und es fehlt nicht an Liturgiologen, die annehmen, daß wir es in den letzten Kapiteln des Clemensbriefes mit Auszügen aus der damaligen Liturgie von Rom zu tun haben. Somit hätten wir hier wenigstens einen Ansaß zu einer bestimmten Form in einem Teile des Gottesdienstes.

Unser zweiter Zeuge ist Gaius Plinius Cäcilus Secundus, Procurator von Bithynia-Pontus unter dem Kaiser Trajan, dessen Briefe an seinen Vorgesetzten jetzt von Kennern in das Jahr 103 gesetzt werden. Seine *Epistula XCVI* ist es, die besonders auf die Gottesdienste der ersten Christen eingeht. Es scheint aus ihm hervorzugehen, daß die täglichen Zusammenkünfte der Christen, von denen die Apostelgeschichte redet, nicht mehr gebräuchlich waren. Seine Beschrei-

bung geht klar auf einen zusammenhängenden, besonders am Sonntag gefeierten Gottesdienst, dessen Bestandteile Psalmodie und Gebete, (Schriftvorlesung) und Vermahnung und die Abendmahls handlung waren. Im Frühgottesdienst waren diese Akte offenbar zu einem gottesdienstlichen Ganzen verbunden; doch redet er nicht über die Anordnung dieser Bestandteile.

Unser dritter Zeuge ist die *Didache ton Dodeka*, die „Zwölfapostel-lehre“, offenbar ein Handbuch für den Unterricht von Katechumenen, zu Ende des ersten oder am Anfang des zweiten Jahrhunderts verfaßt. Hier wird auch Bezug genommen auf das Fasten am Mittwoch und am Freitag, auf den Sonntagsgottesdienst mit Feier des heiligen Abendmahls, auf Gebete und Almosen und andere Akte, die mit zum Gottesdienst gehören. Auch finden wir die Form des Dankagungsgebetes über dem Kelch, das augenscheinlich dem altjüdischen Gebet beim Passahfest nachgebildet ist. Die hier vorliegenden Punkte werden des weitern ausgeführt in gewissen Teilen der Briefe des Ignatius, der auf das Abendmahl und auf Gebete hinweist.

Der letzte Zeuge, den wir anführen wollen, ist Justinus Martyr, der gleichsam das subapostolische Zeitalter beschließt. In seiner ersten Apologie beschreibt Justin den Gottesdienst der Christen ziemlich ausführlich (Kap. 61. 65—67). Die Teile des Gottesdienstes in der damaligen Zeit waren die folgenden: 1. Lektionen (Aufzeichnungen der Apostel oder Schriften der Propheten); 2. Predigt des Präsidenten oder Bischofs; 3. allgemeines Kirchengebet für alle Menschen; 4. Friedenskuß; 5. Darbringung von Brot und Wein mit Wasser; 6. Präfations- oder Dankagungsgebet; 7. Konsekration; 8. Fürbitte für das Volk; 9. Amen der Gemeinde; 10. Austeilung von Brot und Wein an die anwesenden Glieder (den nicht Anwesenden wurden die konsekrierten Elemente durch die Diakonen gebracht).

Aus dieser kurzen geschichtlichen Zusammenstellung geht klar hervor, daß man schon aus den Quellen erkennen kann, wie sich die Kirche des apostolischen und des subapostolischen Zeitalters zu der Form des Gottesdienstes stellte. Im Einklang mit den in der Schrift enthaltenen Grundsätzen hatte sie wirklich „schöne Gottesdienste“; aber dabei beobachtete sie die rechte Mitte zwischen einer kahlen, nichts sagenden Liturgie und einem dramatischen Schauspiel, wie sich das leider später in gewissen Teilen der Kirche entwickelt hat. Diese Punkte sind bei jeder Diskussion über die Liturgie im Auge zu behalten. *)

*) Wir haben uns bei dieser kurzen Untersuchung genau an die Quellen gehalten, an das Neue Testament und an die im Text genannten Schriften. Verglichen wurden sonderlich: Harnack, „Der christliche Gemeindegottesdienst im apostolischen und altkatholischen Zeitalter“; Alt, „Der kirchliche Gottesdienst“; Bingham, *Antiquities*; Bennett, *Christian Archeology*; Kliefoth, „Liturgische Abhandlungen“; Augusti, „Denkwürdigkeiten“; Österley, *Jewish Sources of the Christian Liturgy*; Gwynne, *Primitive Worship and the Prayer-book*; Thiersch, „Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter“; Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, und andere.

The Story of Joseph in the Light of Recent Discoveries.

The most important problem which during the last century has occupied Old Testament scholars has been whether we have in the Pentateuch a unitary work, created by one man at a definite time, or whether it is a product of many centuries, developed gradually, and reflecting various religious currents and social tendencies.

The most striking proof in support of the view that the development of Hebrew into a literary language from the Canaanite dialect spoken by the Hebrews was effected in an Egyptian environment is that the Joseph and Exodus narratives, in which Israel is shown in direct contact with Egypt, reflect clearly the spirit of an Egyptian environment and display visible traces of Egyptian influence.

In the description of the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt a great deal of Egyptian life is illustrated with a detail that could have been derived only from first-hand knowledge and exact observation at close quarters.

A merely superficial examination reveals a whole series of Egyptian words and modes of speech permeated with the spirit and usage of Egyptian language. The foreign nature of the words was so little felt by the Hebrew author that in one verse alone (Ex. 2, 3) no fewer than four Egyptian words are employed, namely, *teba*, for ark; *gome*, for bulrushes; *soof*, for reeds; and *yeor*, for river.

That is a phenomenon only conceivable in a time when the Hebrews were in an Egyptian environment, speaking their own language, but being intensely dominated by that of the Egyptians.

Birth of Hebrew as a Literary Language.

But these borrowings are merely external marks. The true relationship between Hebrew and Egyptian can be appreciated only when we penetrate deeply into the psychology of the Egyptian language and the fibers of its structure.

It is then that we obtain a complete insight into the intimate knowledge which the author of the Pentateuch possessed of the literary language of Egypt. Only then can we realize how his language, though dependent on Egyptian, was able to develop the highest degree of elasticity and individuality and display a fascinating elegance in all its linguistic niceties and *nuances*.

I can do no more than allude here to these philological questions.

1. The patriarchs took with them from Babylonia to Canaan an Aramaic dialect, strongly sprinkled with Assyrio-Babylonian elements. This influenced the Canaanite dialect which they then adopted, inasmuch as reminiscences of Babylonian myths and Assyrio-

Babylonian expressions, reflecting Babylonian conditions, passed into that dialect.

Through its assimilation by the patriarchs with their Aramaic dialect it reached a higher stage of development and began to rise above the level of primitive expression. This was the moment when Hebrews and Canaanites parted ways and when out of the Canaanite a separate dialect began to develop among the Hebrews—as the Hebrew language.

2. This language was retained by the Hebrews in Egypt and was gradually developed under the influence of the Egyptian language. It grew constantly, expanded, enriched, and embellished in such a degree as to create the necessary conditions under which the literary language could mature and be brought to perfection.

Let us now illustrate the Joseph and Exodus narratives from both the linguistic and the archeological points of view.

Old Testament Narrative of Joseph in Egypt.

No sooner does he start telling the story of Joseph than the narrator plunges deeply into Egyptian life. He approaches his readers, not as one conveying something almost unknown, coming from a remote country. Rather, he assumes a complete acquaintance with land and people.

The incident of Potiphar's wife and Joseph reveals the Egyptian background, with all its local coloring.

As for the butler and the baker, we can refer to reliefs depicting those high officials when functioning. In a relief of the middle kingdom we see a butler pouring a drink into the cup of his great lady while she is undergoing the strain of a hair-dressing toilet. In another we see the chief butler receiving his accounts. Other reliefs show bakeries at full work, the men carrying on their heads baskets heaped with cakes, exactly as did the chief baker in the presence of Pharaoh.

No English reader will find anything unusual in that Joseph was shaved as soon as he was freed from the dungeon. It nevertheless points to a characteristic feature in Egyptian conceptions of cosmetic and hirsute propriety which radically differed from that of Joseph's homeland, Canaan. Only Semitic "barbarians" allowed their beards and hair to grow, because in their eyes the beard was a mark of dignity, long hair being the ornament of warriors and heroes. Prisoners and slaves alone were shaved, as a sign of humiliation and dishonor. This appears from passages like 2 Sam. 10, 4.

The Egyptian held an exactly opposite view. The first thing every Egyptian of standing was anxious to do, as soon as he came

of age, was to deliver his head and face to the razor. He grew beard and hair only when mourning for near relatives.

Thus Joseph was made to appear before Pharaoh, not as a barbarian and in foreign garb, but as a well-dressed and well-shaven Egyptian gentleman.

The Seven Kine.

As for the dream of the seven fat and lean kine, Gen. 41, 2, it was pointed out several years ago by others that such a story was only conceivable in Egypt, where the goddess Hathor was worshiped in the form of a cow. And there were seven districts, each having its own Hathor cow; hence the seven kine.

In the tomb of Nefretiti, the beautiful wife of Rameses II, the seven cows are seen accompanied by the bull-god, as if they were marching in solemn procession. And in a papyrus in the British Museum, containing a "Book of the Dead," we see the seven kine ranged above the bull-god in the hall of Ra, or Osiris, all of them having offerings in front of them. Of a similar nature was the picture which appeared to Pharaoh in his dream.

What so much disturbed him and confused his magicians was not the appearance of the seven kine in itself, but the accompanying details — fat and lean kine, followed by seven full and seven empty ears of wheat. The magicians could not but think of all kinds of eschatological connections with the nether world. And that was where Joseph's wisdom came in. He eliminated every connection of the kine with the beyond, but regarded the dream as a prognostication of happenings in the land itself. He saw in the ears of wheat a relation to the food conditions of the country and accordingly interpreted the seven kine and seven ears as "years of plenty" and "of famine."

Here, too, the language testifies to the close relations between Hebrew and Egyptian; for the expression "years of famine" (Gen. 41, 30) is a genuine Egyptian expression, *renep-yaadet*, and the Hebrew presents nothing but a translation of the Egyptian. That the word *akhu*, Gen. 41, 2, is an Egyptian word has long since been established; only it does not mean meadow, but overflowed fields by the sides of the Nile.

Even ordinary phrases of deference, such as might be in vogue at any court, are here highly typical of Egyptian etiquette and only become clear in their right meaning in the light of Egyptian court ceremonial and the Egyptian conception of good breeding. A characteristic formula is the phrase recurring in several passages "to the face of Pharaoh" (Gen. 47, 2, 7; 41, 46), meaning "in the presence of Pharaoh." This corresponds completely with hierarchic court custom, whereby one might not speak to his Majesty (*r heme-f*), but only "to the face of," or "before the face of, his Majesty" (*m her heme-f*, or *hefet her heme-f*).

Moreover, the particulars given Gen. 41, 42 of Joseph's honors which accompanied his installation as vizier with solemn ceremonies perfectly coincide with Egyptian usages. They could not be better illustrated than by the Egyptian inscription and graphic representations in tomb reliefs.

The Golden Neck Chain.

Dressed in garments of fine linen, the distinctive garb of kings and high personages, Joseph received the royal signet, and he was invested with the gold neck chain. The latter was not a mere present, but indicates a special ceremony, showing the investiture of a high state dignitary in a spectacular manner amid the plaudits of the people. It was known as the conferment of the "Gold of Praise," or simply of "the Gold."

In special cases it was the king himself who showered the golden necklaces upon his servants, as we can see from the splendid reliefs in the Tomb of Eye, the favorite of Akhenaton-Amenophis IV (1375—ca. 1355 B. C.).

Royal Favors.

In these pictures we have a description of the conferment of the gold neck chain on Joseph, as given in Gen. 41, 42. But Joseph was the recipient of a greater distinction. For it was the king himself who placed his signet-ring upon Joseph's finger and put the golden chain round his neck. Joseph also was driven in a chariot through the streets, the runners shouting out before him, "*Abrehh!*" which means in Egyptian, "Mind to thee!" as our "Look out!" — an expression which has survived all changes of the ages in Egypt and can still be heard in its Arabic adaptation in the crowded streets of Cairo, namely, "*Balak, Balak,*" i. e., "Mind to thee! Mind to thee!" Often there is added, "*Shemalak,*" "Thy left-hand side," or "*Yemeenak,*" "Thy right-hand side."

The brevity with which these details are given by the Hebrew narrator reveals that such ceremonies were assumed to be familiar to his readers, and therefore he did not deem it necessary to embark upon any exhaustive description, just as to-day complicated and lengthy court ceremonies are generally alluded to in a few words.

Thus the words "And he [Pharaoh] put a gold chain about his neck" (Gen. 41, 42) was interpreted by them just as such words as "His Majesty invested somebody with the insignia of the Garter" would be interpreted by us to-day.

A. S. Yahuda, in the London Daily Telegraph.



inter
of w
reve
of th
up t
these

fear
It is
Such
man
subj
of the
respec
worsh
the w
S
come
Christ
dempt
is brou
God as
trusts
the So
Th

Wh
lost tru
to resis
of Jesu
given u
the fac
sessions,
dition.

Outlines for Sermons on Christian Education.

1.

Ps. 111, 10.

On the report cards that are given to our children at stated intervals we find this motto: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." That is a word of God. By it an important truth is revealed to us, especially important to parents for the upbringing of their children. Parents who do not know this truth cannot bring up their children according to God's will. Let us therefore study these words and learn what our Lord desires to teach us.

"The Fear of the Lord Is the Beginning of Wisdom."

1. *What is the fear of the Lord?*

2. *What is wisdom?*

1.

Text. There is a fear that all men have by nature. It is the fear that God as the Judge will some day punish them for their sins. It is a fear without hope. That is the reason for their fear of death. Such fear possessed the soul of Cain and Judas. This fear causes man to despair. This fear is not the beginning of wisdom, but it subjects man to bondage all his lifetime, Heb. 2, 15. It is the fear of the trembling slave. But the fear of the Lord is that worshipful respect which is linked with the deepest love and confidence, which worships Him as the great Creator and Sustainer of the world, as the wonderful Savior and Comforter of sinners.

Such fear no man has by nature. For all men are sinners and come short of the glory of God. God must be reconciled. Through Christ He reconciled the world unto Himself. Christ's work of redemption. And by the Word which proclaims this reconciliation man is brought to faith and thus reconciled to God. Now he recognizes God as his dear Father, Redeemer, and Comforter and loves Him, trusts in Him, and respects and worships Him. Now God is to him the Source of all blessings.

That fear of the Lord is here called the beginning of wisdom.

2.

What is wisdom? When man lost the fear of the Lord, he also lost true wisdom. Pharaoh, in spite of all his learning, was a fool to resist the almighty Lord. The scribes and Pharisees at the time of Jesus. The prodigal. True wisdom is to put everything God has given us to the right use. He who is without the true wisdom uses the faculties of his soul, the members of his body, his earthly possessions, for his own selfish purposes and hence to his own perdition. The fear of the Lord changes all that. The man who fears

the Lord puts everything he has into the service of God, uses it for His glory and the welfare of his fellow-men. His heart is renewed, his thoughts are changed, his view of life is altogether altered. He now aims for a higher life. He has become wise.

This is of the greatest importance in the upbringing of our children. Our children are born corrupt. Their reason, will, and heart are corrupt. If they grow up in this state, their life in ever-increasing degree will be put into the service of sin. All the learning they acquire at schools, colleges, and universities will not help them. They will use it either for self-aggrandizement or for crime. They will become either proud, self-righteous Pharisees or crafty criminals.

Thus we see that secular knowledge and earthly possessions will be a blessing only if true wisdom teaches the right use of it.

And true wisdom is to be found only where the fear of the Lord is.

And the fear of the Lord can be alone where man by the Holy Ghost has learned to know Jesus, the Savior.

It is necessary therefore for our children to be brought to Jesus. Their training must be based on the Gospel of Christ. No school is good enough for our children unless it is a school where Jesus reigns supreme. He alone can make us wise for this life and the life to come. Remember, you parent, the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. Let us be thankful for our Christian school.

H. J. B.

2.

Mark 10, 13—16.

Our service to-day is arranged principally for our children. Parents and all members wish to hear what the Lord has to say with regard to the upbringing of our children. He has much to say on this subject. Children are very important for human society. Without children, society would cease to exist. Important for the State; children of to-day are citizens of to-morrow. For the home; children will continue the homes of to-day. For the Church; our children will carry on the work of our Church after we have passed away. Therefore important for society, State, home, Church, that children be properly trained. That is principally the duty of the parents. While they may and should accept the aid of the Church, they cannot shift their own responsibilities to any other person or persons. Let us see and study what God has to say.

The God-pleasing Attitude of Parents toward Their Children.

1. *They must look upon them as gifts of God, for which they are responsible to Him;*
2. *They must lead them to Jesus and not keep them away.*

1.

Text. Christ says, "Of such," etc. God claims children for His kingdom. That raises the question, Whose is the child? Many books are written in answer to this question. Bolshevik Russia says that the child belongs to the State. In our own country many take the same position.

It is true, the State must take great interest in children, for they are the future citizens. But that does not make them the property of the State. The State has only so much right over the child as God has given to it.

Do children belong to the Church? Since by Baptism they have become members of the Church, they do belong to the Church; the Church has the right and duty to look after their spiritual welfare, to train them for whole-hearted, intelligent interest in, and labor for, the Church, Matt. 28, 20. Yet to the Church also children are *given*, added by Baptism, as a gift of God. — Parents are wont to say of their children, These are our children. And in a way they may say so. Yet, after all, God has given them their children. Read Ps. 127, 3. In the last analysis children are God's; for He gives them life, He preserves them, He has purchased and won them from death, sin, and the power of the devil that they should be His own and live in His kingdom. Since children are God's own by creation and redemption, God has the right to demand them, and parents are responsible for their children to Him.

2.

God has entrusted children to parents that they should take care of their bodies, provide them with the necessities of life, prepare them for the battle for existence. That requires careful preparation. But that is not the most important duty. Animals prepare their young for that also. Jesus says: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me." Why unto Jesus? Because the child has an immortal soul. This life is not the longest nor the last nor the most important. Eternity will be either everlasting torment or unending bliss. Children are born sinners. Christ has saved them. No salvation without Christ. No help without Him. Therefore children must be brought to Him to be blessed by Him. This is done by having them baptized and by teaching them the Word of God. *Parents* must do this. A congregation may help them in this difficult task, but the responsibility remains theirs. Let them pray therefore for wisdom and faithfulness to perform aright this their greatest duty on earth. Lead your children to Jesus.

Beware of keeping them away from Him! Such a warning is very necessary. Thousands of children are kept away from the Savior because their parents do not tell them of Jesus (there is no reading

of the Bible, no prayer, no religious instruction in the home); or because their parents lead them astray by teaching them lies, evolution, atheism, giving them poison for bread; etc.; or because their parents give them offense by living in sin, by allowing access to evil reading-matter, allowing them to go to movies or such other entertainments as pander to the flesh, etc.; or because their parents are negligent, not using the means provided for them by a Christian congregation — Christian schools.

What Jesus has to say about keeping children away from Him. Much displeased, Matt. 18, 6.

God grant that we all give heed to the instruction and admonition of our Lord.

H. J. B.

3.

Matth. 18, 1—14.

Nicht weniger als die erwachsenen Christen haben ihre Kinder ununterbrochene christliche Erziehung nötig, und nicht weniger als die erwachsenen Unbefehrten haben die unbefehrten Kindlein das Evangelium nötig.

Unser Missionswerk an den Kindern.

1. Die Kleinen sind von Natur verloren; aber Jesus ist gekommen, sie selig zu machen.

A. Die Kleinen sind von Natur verloren. 1. Im Text redet Jesus noch immer von den Kleinen. Die nach Ruhm dürstenden Jünger fragten ihn: V. 1. Jesu Antwort: V. 2—4. Nachdem er vom Ärgernis, das den Kleinen gegeben wird, im besonderen (V. 6) und vom Ärgernis im allgemeinen (V. 7—9) geredet hat, kommt er in seiner Belehrung auf die Kleinen zurück und spricht: V. 10—14. Sowohl sein bekanntes Wort V. 11 als auch das herrliche Gleichnis in V. 12, 13 bezieht sich besonders auf die Kinder; denn er schließt: V. 14. — 2. Jesus gibt den Kleinen Namen, die uns zuerst befremden: „das Verlorne“, „das Verirrte“. Damit bringt er zum Ausdruck die Schriftlehre von der Erbsünde und der wirklichen Sünde samt deren schrecklichen und ewigen Folgen, Ps. 51, 5; Joh. 3, 6; Röm. 7, 18; Gen. 8, 21; Eph. 2, 3. Das Gehen, Suchen, Finden, V. 12, 13, und Retten, V. 11, von seiten des Menschensohnes zeigt deutlich genug die Tiefe des Verderbens der Kleinen. — 3. Die Schriftlehre von dem natürlichen Verderben der Kleinen steht fest trotz aller Philosophie und Gefühlsduselei der selbstgerechten Welt, die „den Verlorenen“ natürliche und geistliche Gerechtigkeit zuspricht, an den natürlichen Stolz der Menschheit, an die natürliche Liebe der Eltern appelliert, um das „unschuldige Kind gegen den harten Ausspruch und das scharfe Urteil des Menschensohnes zu schützen“. Welch ein Selbstwiderspruch, daß dieselbe Welt in ihrem Erziehungswesen doch mit dem von ihr geleugneten natürlichen Verderben der Kinder rechnet! — 4. Fort mit der ver-

derbten Vernunft, mit den fleischlichen, weichen Gefühlen! Wir bleiben bei Jesu Rede, kämpfen den Widerspruch des Fleisches und der Welt nieder und beweinen und beklagen den natürlichen Zustand aller Kinder, auch unserer eigenen. Ihre Unschuld ist dahin, und sie sind von Natur vor Gott verdammt und verloren. Wir können sie nicht erlösen. Ohne Jesum würden wir sie durch Wort, Tat und Beispiel noch tiefer ins Verderben führen.

B. Aber Jesus ist gekommen, sie selig zu machen. 1. Als Zwer seines Kommens und Werkes nennt Jesus im Text die Erlösung der Kinder. Er ward selbst ein liebes Kindlein. Er hat die Kindheit geheiligt, die Erbsünde und die wirkliche Sünde auch der Kleinen getragen und für sie Gottes Gesetz erfüllt. Auch für sie ist er gestorben, und sein Blut macht auch sie rein von aller Sünde. Wie hat er die Kleinen so lieb! — 2. Seine Liebe zu ihnen offenbart er weiter durch Wort und Tat, auch nachdem er sie gefunden hat. a. Er schützt die gläubigen Kinder vor Ärgernis, verheißt ihnen Engelschutz, macht sie zu Vorbildern fester Zuversicht. b. Mark. 10 gibt er seine Liebe zu ihnen kund (NB. nachdem er seinen Unterricht über eheliches Leben gegeben hat). c. Seine weitere liebevolle Fürsorge für die Kleinen offenbart er auch im Stande seiner Erhöhung, indem er die seelsorgerliche Pflege derselben nur solchen übergibt, die ihn aufrichtig lieben, Joh. 21, 15, und auch für sie die Gnadenmittel gegeben hat, Matth. 28, 19. 20. — 3. Haben wir nun Christi Liebe zu den Kleinen gefaßt? Nein, sie geht über Bitten und Verstehen. Wie glücklich die Kirche, die Erzieher, die Eltern, die die Liebe Jesu kennen, auf die eigenen schon gläubigen Kinder in der christlichen Erziehung anwenden und den noch fernern Kindlein verkündigen und anbieten!

Weil die Kindlein von Natur verloren sind, Jesus aber gekommen ist, sie selig zu machen,

2. darum sollen wir in unserm Missionswerk auch die Kindlein bedenken.

A. Unser Missionswerk ist gegründet auf die Schriftlehre von der Rechtfertigung. Diese sollen wir treiben an aller Kreatur, auch an unsern Kindern, und in aller Welt, darum an allen Kindern, Mark. 16, 15. — 1. In unserm Text lehrt Jesus ganz dasselbe. B. 10 sagt er uns, was wir als Kindererzieher und -missionare meiden sollen. Haben wir diese Warnung nötig? Er redet ja zu seinen Jüngern! Auch wir sind geneigt, das Große dem Kleinen vorzuziehen. Wir verachten Christi Kleine, wenn wir ihnen das Evangelium vor- enthalten, unsere geistliche Pflicht ihnen gegenüber vernachlässigen. — 2. Jesus sagt uns B. 5, was wir tun sollen. Gesegnet seien die Hirten, die den Heiland liebhaben und die Kleinen lieben; gesegnet die Gemeinde- und Sonntagschullehrer, die eifrigen Gemeindeglieder, die das Heil der Kinder suchen; gesegnet die Eltern, die mit christlichem Wort und gottgefälliger Tat an den eigenen und andern Kindern

beweisen, daß sie Jesum im Herzen haben. Sie alle nehmen Jesum auf und dienen ihm. — 3. Bedenkt daher die Kleinen im Erziehungs- wesen und in der Missionsarbeit! Jesus eifert für die Kinder; darum mehr Missionare; mehr Gebete und Gaben; mehr Gemeinde- und Sonntagsschulen; mehr Treue in der christlichen Erziehung im Haus, Kirche, Schule; kein Ärgernis, kein Geiz, kein Weltfönn. Wollen manche leichtfertig sein und Luf. 1, 41 mißbrauchen? Da wird uns gesagt, was der Heilige Geist wirken kann; aber in unserm Text ist uns unsere Pflicht auferlegt, die wir erfüllen sollen.

B. Jesus ist unser Erlöser. Als solcher erscheint er im Text. Wieviel haben wir doch versäumt! Unsere Vernachlässigung der Kleinen ist Sünde gegen beide Tafeln des Gesetzes. Wehe uns! V. 6. Aber Jesu Liebe zu den Kleinen ist stellvertretend für alle Schuldigen: Eltern, Lehrer, Gemeindeglieder, Pastoren. Das ist unser Trost. Doch fordert die tägliche Heiligung, daß wir auch seinem Vorbild folgen. — Wie Jesus sich freut über das Gewonnene, V. 13, so sollen auch wir uns freuen. — Laßt uns in unserm Amt an den Kleinen rechte Treue beweisen! Gott wird sein Gedeihen geben. G. H. Smukał.

4.

Mark 10, 13—16.

Our children, what a treasure they are, and at the same time, what a problem!

Here they sit, your little ones and mine, to-morrow's home-makers or home-breakers, to-morrow's curse or blessing to this nation, to-morrow's builders or wreckers of our Church; and remember, what they will be to-morrow depends to a great extent on what we make of them to-day. How to train them aright, how to bring them up that they, even as the Child Jesus, may increase in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and with men; how to instruct, guide, and correct them, so that some day they may be men and women of good character and habits, stalwart citizens, and, above all, heirs of the life to come, that, indeed, is a problem so great that it is hard to imagine a greater one.

Even the world is interested in this matter, that is, so far as the welfare of the home and of the nation is concerned. Yes, it is more than interested; it is frankly worried about it. This world of ours has a headache; and there are many causes of it. There is the "flaming youth" problem, the liquor problem, the divorce problem, the crime problem, — who will enumerate them all? But all these vexing problems — and leading educators and jurists know and admit this — can be traced back to an unsatisfactory solution, rather, to the total lack of a solution of the child problem. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." That is a Biblical axiom whose homely truth even

the most anti-Biblical-minded people must concede. But how to train the child—ah, that is the problem! Educational conferences are discussing it, committees consisting of the best brains of the nation are deliberating on it, men and women who are devoting their whole life to a study of it, are annually writing books and magazine articles by the thousands, but to no avail. And this is the more pathetic since a fully satisfactory, yes, the only possible solution of the problem has been given to the world, and that long, long ago.

That same Book which says: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it," tells us all we need to know about this subject. Let us turn to the simple story told by Mark; for there we have—

The Solution of the Child Problem: "Suffer the Little Children to Come unto Me."

1.

"And they brought young children to Jesus that He should touch them." We can almost see them, those Jewish mothers, as with their little ones they all but mobbed the tired Master. Yes, tired He was, for it had been a busy day. But all signs of fatigue are gone the moment He sees these mothers and their children. Just a minute ago He had spoken on the sanctity of holy wedlock. Now He sees an opportunity to teach what people are to do with the living fruits of the marriage union. "Suffer the little children," says He, "to come unto Me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God."

These words of Jesus tell us, to begin with, that children are not mere playthings, but that they have a soul. "Of such is the kingdom of God." Many people never think of that. Did you ever hear of the "wild children" of Russia? Abandoned, homeless, left to shift for themselves, a ragged, filthy, vermin-covered lot, they prowl about the streets like so many stray dogs, existing on the scraps they find or the food they contrive to steal and sleeping in places which we would not consider fit for kennels. I would never have believed that such conditions could exist in this our day, had I not seen authentic pictures of these miserable creatures taken by an engineer, a Lutheran man of our own city. And yet, who are we to look down on Russia while right here in America we, too, have our "wild children"? And these live not only in the slums; they dwell in hovels and mansions, in country and city; indeed, you will find some in this very block. It is not that their parents do not provide for their bodily welfare. They do, as well as their means permit. Neither am I accusing them of neglecting their children's mental training. Every year fabulous sums are spent for our public-school system. No, I am referring to the deplorable, but incontrovertible fact that millions of American parents are forgetting all

about their children's soul. And that is a tragic, an appalling, a disastrous thing.—Parent, your child has a soul. That soul is immortal. That soul is worth far more than body or mind, yes, than the whole world. I hope you realize that; for a proper realization of this fact is the first step towards the solution of the child problem.

No, our children are not animals. But neither, my friends, are they angels. And this brings us to another point which deserves our most serious consideration. The Scriptures teach—and this doctrine, though not expressly taught in our text, is implied therein—that our children are conceived and born in sin, that they are by nature totally depraved, and that, as a consequence, they are under God's wrath and condemnation. Modern educators deny all this. I shall quote three of their spokesmen; note their word. Says Betts in his book *How to Teach Religion*: "We no longer insist with the older theologians that a child is completely under the curse of original sin. . . . We believe that he has infinite capacities for good and equally infinite capacities for evil, either of which may be developed. We know that at the beginning the child is sinless, pure of heart, his life undefiled." Says Soares in his *Religious Education*: "Men have held that the babe that lies in its mother's arms has a nature utterly corrupt. There is no possibility of good; all its tendencies are towards evil. It is alien from God and under His eternal wrath. . . . It is clear that all these theological theories are unscientific. . . . A child is born unmoral, just as he is born unpolitical. Morality and immorality develop in the social process." Says Wilson in his *Child Psychology and Religious Education*: "The conception of childhood's total depravity, or, at any rate, of its original sin, has had an honored place in theological thought. . . . The science of evolution and the better understanding of the early chapters of Genesis have delivered man's thoughts from this pernicious doctrine."—But enough of this. I already feel as if I had granted these modern heretics too much of our precious time. But I did want to show you how far away these people are from the real solution of the child problem. They do not even know what is wrong with the child. Fact is, they claim that there is nothing wrong with the child. It's evolution, it's the social order, it's environment,—ah, what a word to conjure by these days!—it's nothing in the child, but something outside of the child, that is to blame! But God's inspired and infallible Book gives the lie to these superwise educators of our day and says: "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." And again: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." And because of these and many other Scriptural declarations I cannot but say to you: Parent, your child, no matter how small or sweet it be, is a born sinner. Its nature, mind, and soul are totally depraved and

as such altogether unfit for the kingdom of heaven. Yes, unless a remedy is found, your child is eternally lost. Mark this well, for a thorough knowledge of this fact is another important step towards the solution of the child problem.

Here, then, is the situation. Our children have an immortal soul, intended for the kingdom of God. But as they are by nature, they cannot enter that kingdom, for they are altogether sinful and under the wrath of God. What is the remedy? A better environment? Environment, as we have seen, is not the ultimate cause, and therefore it is evident that a change of it cannot effect a cure. More secular education? It has been well said, "Educate men without religion, and you make them but clever devils." Threats such as "Crime does not pay" may hold children back from the gross outbursts of sin; promises like "Honesty is the best policy" may appeal to their selfish nature. The rod is both necessary and effective in its place; but no amount of threatening, promising, or spanking will make children pure, holy, and right with God. After all, the heart of the child problem is the child's heart. What is needed, and needed in the case of every single child, is a new heart and to that end a new birth, as Jesus said to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "But that requires a miracle," you say. Indeed it does. But there is One who can perform this miracle, yes, who performs it every day. "Suffer the little children to come unto Me." When Jesus spoke these words, He was on His last journey, whose end was Calvary. He had been born for children that by His sinless conception and birth He might hallow their sinful beginning. He had lived for children that by His perfect obedience He might make satisfaction to God for their sinful life. Later He died for children that through His death He might make them heirs of the kingdom of God. And now He commands that the children, your children, all children, be brought to Him. How? Through Holy Baptism and a Christian education. Through Baptism, for it is by this blessed means that the Holy Spirit works faith in the child, gives it a new heart, forgives its sins, and thus makes it a partaker of the kingdom which Jesus has merited with His own blood. And through a continual Christian education and training; for it is through the Word of God taught where such an education is given that the new life kindled through Baptism is nourished, strengthened, and made fruitful unto many good works.

This, my dear parent, is the solution of the child problem: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me." The whole education and training of the child, beginning with its birth and ever thereafter, must be in *one* direction — towards Jesus. Do you understand that? And will you never forget it? Then let us proceed to the practical carrying out of this solution.

2.

This is not an easy task. There are so many difficulties to contend with. The devil, the world, and our flesh would constantly do what the disciples did to those Jewish mothers: "And His disciples rebuked those that brought them." But let us remember that our Lord was "much displeased," was "moved with indignation," over this attitude of the Twelve and that His wrath will most certainly rest upon us if we permit anything to come between Him and our children. "Forbid them not!" Whatever the obstacles, they must and can be overcome for the sake of Jesus and the children whom He loves.

It is also to be noted that the carrying out of this solution is a joint task. God says to parents: "Ye fathers,"—and that does not exclude mothers,— "provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." And God says to the Church: "Feed My lambs." Accordingly it is not for parents to say: "We do not need and shall not use the facilities which the Church has provided for this purpose," or: "Let the Church assume the entire responsibility in this matter. Why should we bother our heads about it?" Neither is it for the Church to say: "It takes too much time and money. Let the parents see to the Christian education of their children. That's their business." No, it is for both, parents and Church, to heed the command of Jesus, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me," and to *cooperate* in this so difficult, but blessed work.

Having been baptized and thus become a child of God and an heir of heaven, the child spends the first and most impressionable years of its life in the home. That home should be so ordered that it becomes for the child the greatest educational agency in the world. And to be that, it must be a Jesus home. The child must be taught to pray to Jesus as soon as its little hands can be folded and its lips can lisp His name. The child must be told of Jesus, and that daily, especially in the family devotion. The child must be admonished and, if need be, punished, but always in such a manner as will lead it to do right and to shun wrong, not for fear of the rod, but because it loves Jesus. In short, the whole home atmosphere must literally breathe the spirit of Jesus, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me." Parents, your church wants to cooperate with you in this gigantic task. That is why I am telling you this. For Jesus' and your child's sake do not let the advice given you go into one ear and out of the other lest you do something that may never be entirely undone and the Savior be moved with indignation.

But your church does more for you parents than to offer you

good advice. Do you see these tiny tots, about seventy-five of them, the kindergarten of our Sunday-school? Did you ever hear them sing and pray and tell the story of "Jesus Blessing Little Children"? Could you think of depriving your child of the instruction and the inspiration given in this class? Then, as your child grows older, continue to send it to our Sunday-school. Though limited to one brief session every Lord's Day, it is an institute of real value. Its aim is to bring all its scholars, especially also the so-called "outsiders," to Jesus. Its teachers are doing what those Jewish mothers did. Let us not do what the disciples did — rebuke them. No, let us be thankful that the Lord has given us such consecrated men and women; let us wish them and their work well on this tenth anniversary of our Sunday-school; and, above all, let all our parents cooperate with them by regularly sending their own children as well as by making a continued and most earnest effort to bring about the enrolment of others.

But the most striking proof that your congregation shuns neither labor nor expense in order to help the parent to carry out the solution of the great child problem is the fact that during all the many years of its existence it has maintained a Christian day-school. The public school does not and cannot bring children to Jesus. The Sunday-school, deserving as it is of our support, can offer but a minimum of Christian education. There is but one school which fills all the needs, especially the soul needs, of the child, and that is a school in which its whole education and training, every minute of the hour and every hour of the day and every day of the school-year, is in *one* direction — towards Jesus. Such a school we have in our Christian day-school. Parent, is your child there? If so, are you seeing to it that it is regular in its attendance and diligent in its studies? And what are you doing for the support of that school, morally, financially, and by your prayers? Would to God that all of us would realize as well as the devil does what this school means to our children; that we love it as much as he hates it and work for it as zealously as he fights against it — for Jesus' and our children's sake!

"And they brought young children to Jesus that He should touch them." Grant, O Lord Jesus, that the whole education and training of our children be a continued bringing of them to Thee. Help us to overcome all the sinister forces which would prevent us from successfully cooperating in this glorious work. And then do Thou also take our children into Thy arms, put Thy hands upon them, bless them, and make them a blessing to home and Church and country. Amen.

OSWALD RIESS.

Miscellanea.

We Must Reach the Individual.

Among the dangers which threaten the life of our Church at this time we may point, first of all, to a perfunctory or mechanical Christianity. It is so easy to become accustomed to the motions of Christianity. Church-going, having been practised from early childhood, becomes a custom, as does attendance at Holy Communion and at meetings of church organizations. Just as mechanical becomes the pledging and giving of some arbitrary sum of money, 5 cents, 10 cents, 25 cents, for the Sunday collection. There is frequently no further thinking connected with these performances; they have simply become habitual. — This condition is often connected with the menace of numbers. We have become a large organization, 800,000 communicants — on paper. There is always danger in a larger group or mass, in a large congregation, in a large church-body, for members to rely upon numbers and to forget their duties as individuals. Every one waits for the other person to do the necessary things. — Moreover, there is the menace of orthodoxism, of relying upon the outward possession of the truth in doctrine. In fact, this may cause church-members, in the pulpit and in the pew, to become sticklers for traditional expressions which have no doctrinal value, just because they have commonly been used. The statement "Why, our fathers always expressed themselves thus and so" is frequently heard. The skeleton is clutched, the substance is forgotten. There is no careful study of the Scriptures for the purpose of applying sound doctrine to new situations and conditions.

History shows that such a condition breeds apathy, lethargy, paralysis, in spiritual matters. As one depends upon the other to do the work of the Lord, this work is neglected more and more. Initiative and self-activity languish and die. There is little or no growth in knowledge pertaining to sound doctrine and Christian life. Specious pleas and excuses become prevalent. And if we add to this the menace of wealth and luxury with its attendant worldliness, which tends to efface the boundary between the world and the Church, and the conditions which make for disintegration are present to an alarming degree.

It is necessary therefore that we once more remember our duty to reach the individual. The pulpit must take care of this need by presenting sermons based upon the most painstaking exegetical study and with applications intended for the particular congregation to which the sermon is addressed. Collections of sermons become a menace unless every sermon taken from such collections is recast to fit the needs of the individual congregation. The various organizations within the congregation operating under its auspices must receive the attention of the faithful pastor in the same manner. The truth of the Bible, the needs of the Church, must be presented to each society and to every member of every society in such a way as to be clearly understood by every one present, so that every one may feel his obligation and responsibility in the matter. When the pastor receives announcements for the Lord's Supper, he must take occasion to speak to the individual, not only in a general way regarding the doctrine

of the Eucharist and other Scriptural truths, but also with regard to his status in the kingdom of God and his work for the Lord. The custom of pastoral visiting (not only sick-calls) must be inaugurated once more. In short, wherever and whenever the pastor comes into contact with any of his members, he ought to present and discuss some phase of the Lord's work. If this is done throughout our Church for a number of years and continued in the future, we shall, with the help of God, succeed in restoring a more general, vital interest in the work of the Lord in our midst.

P. E. K.

The Tre Ore of Good Friday.

The observance of Good Friday is becoming general in our country. According to a late report the following States have made Good Friday a legal holiday: Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee, as well as the Philippines and Porto Rico. Several State legislatures are now considering bills to follow the example of the above-mentioned commonwealths. The Roman Catholics rejoice over this fact, as their weekly journal *America* states, because it will make the observance of the *Tre Ore*, the three hours of Christ's agony on the cross, a general custom. The Roman Catholics have the Mass of the Presanctified at this time, and this is followed by almost continuous services throughout the afternoon and evening, "so that hardly a moment passes that does not see hundreds of people on their knees in adoring Him who for our transgressions was hanged upon the bitter tree." — In observing the *Tre Ore* period, Lutheran churches will do well to avoid every appearance of following Roman Catholic customs. We have excellent orders of service for Good Friday, which may well be studied and used by our congregations.

P. E. K.

Weiteres zum Jubiläum der Lutherbibel.

Da die drei in der ersten Hälfte des laufenden Jahrganges erschienenen Artikel über die deutsche Bibel, die dann auch im Separatdruck herausgegeben worden sind, dazu bestimmt waren, als Vorlagen für Konferenzbesprechungen zu dienen und sonderlich auch Material für Vorträge und Predigten zu liefern, hat vielleicht dieser oder jener Leser gemeint, das Gebotene sei für das wissenschaftliche Studium etwas zu elementar. Dies war uns nicht unbekannt, und eben aus diesem Grunde haben wir bei verschiedenen Bücherbesprechungen auf diesem Gebiet in den letzten Jahren auch auf wissenschaftliche Werke hingewiesen, für die sich Eingeweihte interessieren dürften. Nun steht es nicht so, daß neuere Werke die dargebotene Geschichte der deutschen Bibel etwa verändern würden; denn diese Tatsachen bleiben stehen. Aber was in den letzten zwanzig Jahren auf dem Gebiete der Forschung über die deutsche Bibel geleistet worden ist, kann manchen Punkt vervollständigen und wohl auch etwas klarer darlegen. Für solche, die Zeit und Gelegenheit haben, sich eingehender mit dem ganzen Thema zu befassen, nennen wir einige der hervorragendsten Werke auf dem Gebiet. Es sind die folgenden: Deutsche Bibelauszüge des Mittelalters zum Stammbaum Christi, mit ihren lateinischen Vorbildern und Vorlagen herausgegeben und erläutert von Hans Vollmer-Hamburg; Zwei fast verschollene Bibeln aus dem Beginn des vorigen Jahrhunderts von Hans Vollmer; Die „Wormser Pro-

pheten“; Eine vorlutherische evangelische Prophetenübersetzung aus dem Jahre 1527 von Georg Varing; Die Psalmenverdeutschung von den ersten Anfängen bis Luther, herausgegeben in Gemeinschaft mit Fris Jülicher und Willy Lüdtke von Hans Vollmer (2 Bde.); Quellenstudien zu Luthers Bibelübersetzung von Theo. Pahl, Weimar 1931; Im Kampf um die Bibel von Jos. Klapper, Breslau 1922; Die nationale Aneignung der Bibel von Konrad Burdach, Halle 1924; Studien zur mittelalterlichen Bibelübersetzung vor Luther von Fr. Maurer, Heidelberg 1927; Evangelii und Epistel teutsch von Paul Pietich, Göttingen 1927; Studien zur mittelalterlichen Bibelübersetzung von Walther Ziesemer, Halle 1928; Die Prophetenübersetzung des Claus Tranc von Walther Ziesemer, Halle 1930; Luther und die Bibel von Albert Schramm, Leipzig 1923. Diese Bücher bringen, wie gesagt, im großen und ganzen nichts *wesentlich* Neues, aber man findet in ihnen manches, was der Ergänzung dient und weiteres Licht auf die deutsche Bibelübersetzung wirft.

P. C. R.

Lehrverhandlungen — Lehrvorträge.

Wenn man in unsern Tagen der Versammlung einer Distriktsynode beizuohnt, so findet man manches anders als vor einigen Jahrzehnten. Damals wurden die meisten Distriktsynoden innerhalb größerer Gemeinden abgehalten; jetzt findet sich eine ganze Reihe von Distrikten, die sich in Synodalanstalten versammeln. Damals tagten die Distriktsynoden so, daß man einen Synodalsonntag hatte, an dem die Synodalen gemeinschaftlich zum Gottesdienst gingen. Heutzutage hat man gewöhnlich nur einen Gottesdienst, einen Abendgottesdienst, für die Synodalen. Manche dieser Veränderungen sind durch die Zeitverhältnisse herbeigeführt worden und mögen an und für sich dem Segen der Synodalsitzungen wenig Abbruch tun. Unser hastendes Zeitalter kann sich kaum dazu entschließen, irgend etwas langsam und bedächtig zu tun; alles muß im Sturmschritt geschehen, und man drängt immer wieder, doch ja bald fertig zu werden, um wieder heimzukommen. *Tempora mutantur.*

Aber in einer Hinsicht kann man die Veränderungen der Jetztzeit nicht ganz billigen, nämlich in der Art und Weise, wie vielfach die Lehrbesprechungen geführt werden. Vor vierzig bis fünfzig Jahren und vorher hatte man wirklich *Lehrverhandlungen*. Nach der damaligen Weise war der Referent eigentlich nur der Leiter der Diskussion. Er stellte Thesen und verfaß diese mit den nötigen Beweisstellen aus der Schrift sowie mit Zeugnissen aus unsern Bekenntnissen und aus den Büchern angesehener Lehrer der Kirche. Dann referierte der Leiter der Verhandlungen, nicht aus dem Stegreif, sondern auf Grund der vorliegenden Stellen und Zeugnisse, und nach jedem Abschnitt einer These wurde von den anwesenden Synodalen dazu geredet. Vielfach lieferten solche Redner etwa so viel Material wie der eigentliche Referent, und geschickte Schriftführer verarbeiteten das Gesagte für die Protokolle. So wurde das Material tatsächlich von allen Anwesenden durchgedacht und durchgesprochen, und es blieb haften und brachte Frucht.

Heutzutage hat man auf unsern Synodalversammlungen vielfach nur Lehrvorträge. Der Referent erhält den Auftrag, genug Material für etwa fünf Stunden bereit zu haben, und er schreibt dann auch gewissenhaft genug auf, um eben so viele Stunden auszufüllen. Wenn dann überhaupt

noch hie und da fünfzehn Minuten übrig sind für Bemerkungen, so fühlt schon jedermann in der ganzen Versammlung, daß man sich nun aber auch beeilen müsse, denn sonst ist die Zeit verstrichen. Auch ist oft in den Lehrvorträgen tatsächlich alles bis in die kleinsten Details ausgeführt worden, so daß nicht viel mehr dazu gesagt werden kann. Aber diese Weise ist nicht so gut für das Durchdenken des Referates oder der Thesen. Man hat es wohl angehört und sich über den Fleiß und die Gründlichkeit des Referenten gefreut, aber man hat sich nicht selber daran beteiligt. Und das ist keine gute Weise.

Da wäre uns die Weise, die in unsern Tagen von vielen größeren Vereinen befolgt wird, doch lieber. Es wird ein Mann als Leiter der Verhandlungen bestimmt. Dieser Redner führt den Hauptgedanken des Themas in seinen Grundzügen aus. Ihm folgen nach jedem Hauptabschnitt vier bis sechs Redner, die einschlägige Gedanken ausführen oder Anwendungen machen. Bei Befolgung dieser Weise wundert man sich gar nicht, daß die Zahl derer, die sich an den Verhandlungen beteiligen, nachdem die Leiter ihre Sache beendet haben, eine sehr große ist. Es wäre der Mühe wert, sich diese Weise etwas näher anzusehen, damit wir auf unsern Konferenzen sowohl wie besonders auf unsern Synodalversammlungen wirklich Lehrverhandlungen, Lehrbesprechungen, haben. Dann nähmen ohne Zweifel alle Anwesenden viel mehr mit nach Hause. P. E. K.

Babylon — Rome.

In a recent most interesting book by Barnes, *The Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul*, this learned Catholic scholar also touches upon the question of identifying Rome with the Babylon of the First Epistle of Peter. The author says: "That Babylon in this place must be taken to denote the imperial city and cannot be referred to either the ancient Babylon in Chaldea or to the fortress of that name in Egypt is a matter on which all scholars are now agreed and which may be taken as beyond controversy. Ancient writers are absolutely unanimous on this point, without even a single exception." "The name of Babylon was in common use both among Jews and Christians to denote Rome as the great oppressor." (Pp. 8. 39.) If one considers the source of this emphatic statement, its importance is readily seen.

P. E. K.



Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Aus der Synode. Die Distriktsblätter der letzten Monate beschäftigen sich fast ausschließlich mit den Nachrichten über die Distriktsynodalsitzungen. Trotzdem wir noch fast überall im Zeichen der Heimsuchung Gottes stehen, zeugen viele der Nachrichten doch von Mut und Gottvertrauen. Aus Oklahoma kommt die Nachricht, daß sich die Beiträge für den entsprechenden Zeitraum dieses Jahr etwa verdoppelt haben. Es scheint sich hier und anderswo zu zeigen, daß die Christen in unsern Gemeinden den Ernst der Sachlage erkennen und bereit sind, wirkliche Opfer zu bringen, wenn ihnen erklärt wird, wie es tatsächlich steht. Es ist durchaus nötig, daß jeder wahre Christ in unsern Gemeinden erkennt: „Sein' Arbeit darf nicht ruhn.“ — Ganz besonderen Mut und außerordentliche Ausdauer beweisen auch die Distrikte in Südamerika, wie die Berichte über die beiden Synodalsitzungen zeigen. Ein von dem Concordia-Verlag in Porto Alegre herausgegebenes Büchlein führt in anschaulicher Weise die Arbeit dieses Geschäfts vor. Der Verlag arbeitet sich je länger, desto entschiedener empor. — Aus dem Südlichen Distrikt kommt die Nachricht, daß in Florida eine Sonntagschule besteht, die Schüler aus verschiedenen Sprachen und Rassen aufweist: englische, deutsche, schottische, irische, skandinavische, italienische, jüdische und spanische Schüler (aus den Philippinen). Auf der Fichteninsel hat man neulich ein Kirchengebäude für \$25 errichtet. — Aus verschiedenen Distrikten wird berichtet, daß man Gottesdienste für die Sommerfreischüler einrichtet. Mancherorts werden diese Gottesdienste im Freien abgehalten. Auch in den öffentlichen Anstalten wird die Mission in manchen Distrikten mit großem Eifer und mit großer Zielbewußtheit betrieben, so z. B. in Minnesota. — Die Direktoren der Synodalanstalten zur Ausbildung von Pastoren und Lehrern werden mit großem Eifer um Schüler, da die Statistik nachzuweisen scheint, daß wir innerhalb eines Jahrzehnts kaum genug Kandidaten werden entlassen können, um die gewöhnlichen Lücken (durch Tod und Resignation) zu füllen. — Unter den Männern, die dieses Jahr ihr goldenes Amtsjubiläum feiern, finden sich die folgenden: Prof. D. D. Gattstädt von unserer Milwaukee Concordia, Präses G. Daib in Nord-Wisconsin, P. G. Dannensfeldt, P. B. Keller von Kansas, der während der fünfzig Jahre derselben Gemeinde gedient hat, P. A. G. Rung, der jetzt in der Blindenmission tätig ist, P. C. Merkel, Vorsteher des Waisenhauses zu Marwood, Pa., P. J. Rupperecht, Hauseditor in unserm Concordia-Verlag. Dazu kommen noch die folgenden emeriti: A. Bartling in Ortonville, Minn., A. Raumeher in Lancaster, O., G. Kühle in Cleveland, O., und D. Brätorius in Louisville, Ky. P. C. R.

The Quadricentennial of the German Bible. — Under this heading the *Australian Lutheran* reports how the quadricentennial of Luther's Bible was observed by our Lutheran brethren living in and about the city of Adelaide, Australia. It says: "It was an imposing gathering that assembled at the Adelaide Town Hall on April 29, at 2.30 in the afternoon, to demonstrate that Luther's great work, the translation of the Bible, is appreciated still, though four hundred years have passed by since the work was completed. The gathering consisted almost exclusively of members

of the metropolitan congregations as also of those near by in the country. It is estimated that well over a thousand people were present. A special program for the occasion had been printed in attractive form, and in it were set out not only the order of procedure for the afternoon, but also many interesting references to the German and English versions of the Bible as we now have them. Prof. M. T. Winkler read the lesson and led the prayer. The first speaker was Pastor H. Hassold of Eudunda, who outlined the work that Luther accomplished in translating the Bible. He was followed by Pastor W. Janzow, who spoke on the relation of the Bible to the whole of Luther's work and the subsequent attitude of the Lutheran Church towards the Bible. Finally Prof. H. Hamann spoke on the influence of Luther's translation upon the English Authorized Version. An imposing feature of the celebration was the massed choir, which, under the baton of Mr. V. Appelt of Eudunda, rendered the anthems *Send Out Thy Light* (Gounod) and *Glorious Is Thy Name* (Mozart). A further gathering was held on Wednesday, May 2, in the Adelaide Town Hall. Some four hundred people, many of them strangers, attended. Addresses were delivered by Pastors C. Hoopmann, T. Lutze, and E. Graebner, and anthems were rendered by the choir. Pastor Hoopmann spoke on Modernism and the Bible, Pastor Lutze dwelt on the testimony of archeology to the truth of the Bible, and Pastor Graebner spoke on the inspiration of the Bible. To attract public attention to these celebrations, the Luther League had arranged for a Bible exhibit in a prominent show-window in Rundle Street. The British and Foreign Bible Society kindly furnished a few rare Bibles to supplement the exhibit. A German Bible printed in 1543 — before Luther's death — served to illustrate what kind of type was used in the earliest printed Bibles. Another very interesting exhibit was that lent by General Dean of Mount Lofty, an old German Bible, illustrated with hand-paintings. The display attracted much attention."

In concluding his address, Prof. H. Hamann said: "Luther was not like a star, dwelling apart; he was rather like some central sun, sending forth life-giving, fructifying, stimulating rays in all directions; and partly influenced by these rays, Tyndale became the great English translator. Hence we and all who prize the English Bible owe some debt of gratitude for this treasure, under God, to Martin Luther."

The Sunday afternoon service (April 29) was broadcast by two radio stations, 5CL and 5CK of Adelaide. Prior to the celebration, on April 27, Prof. H. Hamann published in the *Advertiser*, South Australia's morning daily, an article entitled "Translation of the Bible — Luther's Great Work." This article a Roman Catholic weekly, the *Southern Cross*, answered with a tirade against Luther, "in which some of the many falsehoods which Rome keeps on hand to besmirch the fair fame of the great Reformer were repeated." In refuting the Roman Catholic "outburst of misrepresentation and falsehood," the *Australian Lutheran* quotes, among others, the Jesuit historian Audin, who writes as follows of Luther's masterly translation: "Luther's translation of the Bible is a noble monument of literature; a vast enterprise, which seemed to require more than the life of a man, but which Luther accomplished in a few years. The poetic soul finds in this translation evidences of genius and expressions as natural, beautiful, and melodious as in the original languages. Luther's translation some-

times renders the primitive phrase with touching simplicity, invests itself with sublimity and magnificence, and receives all the modifications which he wishes to impart to it. It is simple in the recital of the patriarchs, glowing in the predictions of the prophets, familiar in the gospels, and colloquial in the epistles. The imagery of the original is rendered with undeviating fidelity; the translation occasionally approaches the text. [?] We must, then, not be astonished at the enthusiasm which Saxony felt at the appearance of Luther's version. Both Catholics and Protestants regarded it an honor done to their ancient idiom." J. T. M.

Shall Lutherans over against Each Other Practise Open Communion and Pulpit-Fellowship? — On this question we find the following remarks in the *Lutheran* of May 10: "We have in hand a pamphlet written by the talented, consecrated, and active president of St. Olaf College, Dr. L. W. Boe. He titles it 'God's Movement' and solemnly summons every Lutheran general body in the United States and Canada to revise the ruling that denies participation in the Lord's Supper to any Lutheran on the ground that the congregation to which this person belongs is connected with a general body which has not officially been declared in altar-fellowship with the general body to which the congregation administering the Sacraments belongs. That is a ponderous sentence, and we state a case. According to the rule now operative no member of a Church of the United Lutheran Church is allowed to receive the Lord's Supper in any administration of it conducted by the Missouri, Norwegian, or American churches. He can present himself (properly prepared) at altars of the Augustana and United Danish congregations. Missouri excludes all except its own members. Dr. Boe argues that pastors and congregations shall be given the right to admit Lutherans provided they are 'worthy' in doctrine and intention, regardless of the general body to which they belong.

"He proposes a similar amendment of the rule 'Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran preachers,' so as to lodge jurisdiction over exchanges of pulpits among Lutherans in the individual pastors, with instruction of course to maintain confessional fidelity, dignity, and edifications in their ministry of the Word. Dr. Boe believes the doctrinal unity now existent among Lutherans is so nearly complete as to justify this modification of the Galesburg Rule. By so doing, all Lutherans can have access to the means of grace in any community in which a Lutheran church is located. He urges the general bodies to consider revision of this rule at their next meeting. He does not believe we are yet ready for organic union."

We merely wish to remark the following: — 1. It is conceivable that a body bearing the Lutheran name is more heterodox than, let us say, a certain Presbyterian communion; hence the mere possession of the name Lutheran cannot be held to entitle a person to a place at our altars or in our pulpits.

2. Whatever action charity may prescribe in certain special cases no policy regarding pulpit- and altar-fellowship must be adopted which will sanction false teaching.

3. The large Lutheran bodies are not yet in a position to establish pulpit- and altar-fellowship among themselves. There are grave difficulties in the way which first have to be removed.

4. While it may be true that now and then harm has been done by

an overzealous emphasis on purity of doctrine, everybody who is not blind must see that the harm which has come, and is continually coming, to the Church through laxity and indifference in doctrine is far greater.

5. The U. L. C. itself, as the *Northwestern Lutheran* points out, is pledged to the above principle. Its Declaration says "that until a more complete unity of confession is attained than now exists, the United Lutheran Church in America is bound in duty and in conscience to maintain its separate identity as a witness to the truth which it knows, and its members, its ministers, its pulpits, its fonts, and its altars must testify only to that truth." There is no reason why this should not apply to relations with heterodox Lutherans as well as with the Reformed. A.

The Merger of the Reformed Church and the Evangelical Synod of North America. — On June 26 and 27, at a convention held at Cleveland, O., the merger between the Reformed Church and the Evangelical Synod of North America was consummated. Since the Reformed Church in the United States has 346,945 members and the Evangelical Synod 259,896, the united membership will be more than six hundred thousand. The faculty of Eden Seminary at Webster Groves, Mo., will be strengthened by three professors from the Central Seminary of the Reformed Church, which until the merger was maintained at Dayton, O. The Reformed Church, however, will retain its seminary at Lancaster, Pa., for the use of students living in the East, including those who are now in the Evangelical Synod. The church property of the united body is valued at \$96,000,000. The missions of the Evangelical Synod are in South America, Honduras, and India; those of the Reformed Church are in China, India, Japan, and Iraq. Medical work and schools are included in the missions of both. The Evangelical Synod carries on nine deaconess hospitals and two homes for epileptics and feeble-minded, also six homes for the aged. The Reformed Church maintains five orphanages and four homes for the aged. The Reformed Church is strong in the Eastern States, while the Evangelical Synod has most of its churches in the Central West. The merger was approved by the "classes" of the Reformed Church in September, 1933, and by the General Conference of the Evangelical Synod in October, 1933. The union is to be organic, not federative nor administrative.

J. T. M.

Episcopalians Discuss Preserving a Properly Qualified Ministry. At their Church Congress, which met in April in Philadelphia and which, by the way, is nothing but a free debating society within the confines of this communion, meeting annually, Episcopalians looked at the question how their Church might keep men that are unfit out of the holy ministry. The essayist who treated this subject, Bishop Coadjutor Washburn, asserted that in a certain diocese, as a careful investigation had disclosed, of sixty men who recently were admitted to the ministry one-third should never have been ordained. Episcopalians have a system which makes candidates run a formidable gauntlet before they can reach the goal of a rectorate. In the first place, the rector and the vestry of the parish to which the candidate belongs must testify to his fitness; next, a board of examining chaplains tests his intellectual qualifications; in the third place, the standing committee of the diocese scrutinizes his credentials and the results of the aforementioned examination and possibly

launches into a little investigation of its own before passing on his fitness; and finally the bishop of the diocese has to be satisfied that he is dealing with a worthy candidate. In this array of hurdles theological seminaries have not been mentioned, although they, too, play a rôle. It is taken for granted that, as a rule, candidates attend one of the theological seminaries of the Church, where they are equipped for meeting the board of examining chaplains. Bishop Washburn finds little fault with the rules of his denomination for admitting men to ordination. What he stresses, deserves repetition here: "We are all beginning to learn, it is to be hoped, that legislation of itself cures few ills. Canonical as well as civil law can and will be disregarded if men wish to ignore it. Granted consciences actively functioning in those responsible for the admission of men to the ministry, the number of misfits will be greatly reduced." Now and then the view is expressed that church-bodies with an episcopalian polity function more smoothly than those that have a congregational basis and that the former have fewer difficulties to contend with than the latter. It seems the above might help to disillusion those holding such a view.

A.

The Convention of Northern Presbyterians.—In big headlines the press reported that at the convention of the Northern Presbyterians, held in May in Cleveland, O., the Fundamentalists were defeated. There were several issues on which they were outvoted. In the first place, their candidate for the position of Moderator was not elected, the position going to Dr. William Chalmers Covert, who in the *Literary Digest* is described as a Liberal. In the second place, the Independent Board of Foreign Missions, organized by the Fundamentalists, was ordered by the Assembly to desist "from exercising any ecclesiastical or administrative functions, including solicitation of funds within the Church." All Presbyterian ministers and laymen who are members of the board must, according to the resolution of the Assembly, sever their connection with it under pain of being made the subjects of church discipline if they do not obey within ninety days. This Independent Board, it will be recalled, was organized when it became evident that Modernism had invaded the foreign field of Presbyterian mission endeavors. Matters came to a head through the case of Mrs. Pearl Buck, who was one of the Presbyterian missionaries in China and who had come to doubt the virgin birth of our Savior. Although she resigned from mission service, the Fundamentalists were not satisfied with the attitude of the official board and decided to organize a mission venture of their own. Having called several missionaries to represent them abroad, it will have to be seen whether the Fundamentalists will submit to the decree of the Assembly. In the third place, the Fundamentalists opposed the projected union of the Northern Presbyterians with the United Presbyterian Church. It is a rather strange situation which exists with respect to these two church-bodies. The Northern Presbyterians are described as a denomination having a good creed, but a liberal constituency. The United Presbyterians, on the other hand, are said to have a poor creed, but a conservative membership. The document of union is charged by the Fundamentalists to be of such a nature that the contemplated union would represent a church-body with a poor creed and a large liberal membership. It was on this account that the Fundamentalists

opposed the union, feeling that the cause of truth would not gain thereby. When the vote was taken, however, it was shown that they were decisively defeated. The General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church will likewise have to vote on the union project, and if it approves of it, the presbyteries of both churches will have to express themselves on it. "If two-thirds of the presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church and a majority of the presbyters in the United Presbyterian Church give their assent, the union becomes final in 1936."—The skies look dark for the Conservatives in the Northern Presbyterian Church. It is held by some observers that, if the proposed union comes about, a split is bound to occur, resulting in the formation of a Conservative Presbyterian Church.

After the above had been written, press dispatches brought the information that the Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church voted negatively on the question of union with the Northern Presbyterians. A.

The Ultimate Cause of Our Troubles.—The Northern Baptists are experiencing difficulties similar to those through which our Church is passing. A committee has drafted a plan looking to a complete reorganization of the work of the denomination, and in the *Watchman-Examiner* issues of the last months this plan was thoroughly discussed by interested readers. What one of them writes in the issue of April 19 deserves to be heeded by us, too: "The real seat of our denominational difficulties is not in the realm of organization. In making these statements, I would not imply that there is no need of improving our organizational *régime*. There is grave uncertainty, however, as to whether the changes proposed, if adopted, will really improve the functioning of our convention and its cooperating agencies. The seat of our difficulties is in the local church; in the state of the thought-life and the heart-life of the members individually and collectively. It is the quality of life that lies behind our organized life as a convention that is conditioning its efficiency. We need to turn our attention therefore to the problem of improving the life of the churches. . . . Even a cursory study of church-life will disclose the following realities in the situation: 1. Superficial understanding of what it means to be a Christian; 2. lack of vital religion in the lives of most church-members; 3. invasion of the churches by a vast body of pagan life and practises; 4. utterly inadequate programs of Christian education. The mere mention of these realities is sufficient for those who know the fellowship life of the Church." Must we not say that this Baptist hit the nail on the head? If we should be called on to diagnose our own case, would not the four points which he mentions be included in the list of ills which we should draw up? Proper diagnosis—let us not fail to engage in it.

A.

Fosdick and War.—One of the major topics of discussion in church circles this spring was a speech in which Dr. Fosdick set forth his attitude toward war. He gave his address the title "My Account with the Unknown Soldier." We submit some of its striking sentences: "You may think that I, being a Christian minister, did not know him [the Unknown Soldier]. I knew him well. . . . I lived with him in dug-outs, in the trenches, and on destroyers, searching for submarines off the shores of France. Short of actual battle, from training-camp to hospital, from the fleet to No-Man's Land, I, a Christian minister, saw the war. Moreover,

I, a Christian minister, participated in it. I, too, was persuaded that it was a war to end war. I, too, was a gullible fool and thought that modern war could somehow make the world safe for democracy. They sent men like me to explain to the army the high meanings of war and, by every argument we could command, to strengthen their *morale*. I wonder if I ever spoke to the Unknown Soldier. One night, in a ruined barn behind the lines, I spoke at sunset to the company of hand-grenaders who were going out that night to raid the German trenches. They told me that on an average no more than half a company came back from such a raid, and I, a minister of Christ, tried to nerve them for their suicidal and murderous endeavor. . . . If I blame anybody about this matter, it is men like myself, who ought to have known better. We went out to the army and explained to these valiant men what a resplendent future they were preparing for their children by their heroic sacrifice. O Unknown Soldier, however can I make that right with you? . . . When the words that I would speak about war are a blistering fury on my lips and the encouragement I gave to war is a deep self-condemnation in my heart, it is of that I think. For I watched war lay its hands on these strongest, loveliest things in men and use the noblest tributes of the human spirit for what ungodly deeds! Is there anything more infernal than this, to take the best that is in man and use it to do what war does? . . . I am not trying to make others sentimental about this. I want them to be hard-headed. We can have, on the one side, this monstrous thing, or we can have Christ, but we cannot have both. O my country, stay out of war!"

What marvelous display of deep feeling for a temporal blessing—earthly peace! Fosdick has so dedicated himself to the abolition of war that he entirely loses his balance and brands every participation in war as sinful, it seems. But divine truth, revealed in the Scriptures, which leads to true, everlasting freedom, to heavenly bliss, is blithely ignored by this crusader. Fosdick and his associates have caught a vision of the life that now is, but not of that which is to come. They are working for the things that are seen, which are temporal, and not for the things that are not seen, which are eternal, 2 Cor. 4, 18. A.

An Astronomer Rebukes Modernistic Preachers.—While many so-called ministers of Christ fail to see that Modernism spells the death of Christianity, there are intelligent laymen who realize this very clearly. We take pleasure in reprinting the letter which an astronomer addressed to the *Christian Century* and which certainly is to the point. When the writer speaks of entertaining a "reverent agnosticism," we do not quite understand what he means. It may be that he has nothing more in mind than the limitations of our human, intellectual powers. We now submit the letter without further comment:—

"SIR: A recent issue of the *Century* points out a superfluity of ministers. It would be most astonishing if, when all other professions are overstocked, the ministry should escape congestion. But the results of a questionnaire, as reported in your columns, indicate that an alarming percentage of seminary students are either uncertain regarding matters of prime importance or, what is worse, definitely contrary to the most sacred teachings of Christianity. What business has one who questions the immortality of man or the divinity of Christ in the clergy? If Chris-

tianity to him is merely a system of ethics, let him live according to its principles (as some of the rest of us are trying to do); but let it be made clear that one cannot expect to be supported solely by good living. If he believes that the ministry offers opportunities for culture and scholarship, it may be pointed out that the average congregation cannot finance the development of his genius. Let him follow an academic career. He may find that he has made a slip in counting his mental blessings.

"As an astronomer I do not turn to the Bible for cosmological information, but I do not worry over the much-harped-on scientific fallacies — they are inconsequential. I admit a reverent agnosticism; for certainly I should not expect to comprehend the Maker of this complex universe or the cosmical significance of a single human being. But when I go to church, I want to hear a sincerely consecrated man who speaks with convictions and who prays as though he were sure he had a party at the other end of the line. The Author of Christianity interpreted His position as well as our own with respect to God and the future life in no uncertain terms. I can see no half way about Christianity; if divinely inspired, it leaves no questions to be asked; but if its origin is human, it is shorn of its power, is incongruous, and a bitterly disappointing delusion. In any case the Church will decay if it entrusts itself to these weak sisters with their emasculated religion." — *William A. Calder*, Harvard Observatory, Harvard, Mass.

A.

Southern Presbyterians Vote Not to Return to Federal Council.

At its meeting in Montreat, N. C., early in June, the Presbyterian Church in the United States, better known as the Southern Presbyterian Church, considered the question whether it should again become a member of the Federal Council. Several presbyteries urged that membership relations with the Federal Council be reestablished. When the matter came before the Assembly, a lively debate ensued. By and by a vote was taken, and the resolution to rejoin the Federal Council was defeated. It is with an aching heart that one realizes that there are Presbyterians who are more critical of the Federal Council than the U. L. C., which maintains a consultative membership relation to the Council.

A.

The Backlash of the Depression. — In the *Lutheran Herald* Pastor O. J. Lutness of the United Norwegian Church sounds a warning against "the backlash of the depression." He writes: "Maybe I should not use the word *backlash*. Reaction would be a nicer word; but reaction is such a broad, general term. It can be positive and constructive in its results as well as negative and hurtful. Since there is a lurking danger that man may become depression-minded and reactionary towards the working program of our Church and since this will work havoc with both man and the Church, I have chosen to use this harsher term. The term *backlash* has a decided sting in it. I am happy and proud to state that the constituency of our Church has striven very nobly to keep our Church working during the times of stress that we are enduring. They have succeeded, too, in a way that has warmed the heart to behold. But we know also that there are those within our Church who have given nothing or very little and have used the depression as an alibi. To be fair, I will say that some have not been able to give, have even become destitute themselves. I do not refer to these. The fact remains nevertheless that

some who could have helped have not done so and have used the depression as their excuse. There is an insidious danger here for our own soul as well as for the Church. The present crisis may seem plausible as an excuse, but it will coax us into the habit of thinking that some time later, when the economic situation improves, we shall again do our full share towards supporting our Church. As a reply to this allow me to point out two facts. In the first place, the return to normalcy will be a slow, toilsome, up-hill climb. Some of us will not live to see the day when this depression is but a memory. Secondly, if all of us, or even most of us, should take this negative attitude, there would be no Church left to support when the present crisis has run its course." There is certainly much food for thought in this timely warning against "the backlash of the depression."

J. T. M.

Change of Name to be Noted. — "The National Conference of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America has just concluded its sessions in Minneapolis. The Central Lutheran Church, of which Dr. J. A. O. Stub is pastor, was the host to the convention. With practical unanimity the delegates, nearly one thousand in number, voted to change the name of the organization to 'The Evangelical Lutheran Church of America.'" So reports the *Christian Century*. It will be noted at once that the name is too general and comprehensive. The uninitiated student will be led to think that this church-body comprises all people in America who call themselves Evangelical Lutheran. The same objection was raised against other too inclusive names: United Lutheran Church, American Lutheran Church, and American Lutheran Conference. While chronicleing our dissatisfaction, we of course fully realize the difficulties which confronted the respective synodical committee. — More important than the question of name is that of doctrine and practise. Will this church-body which now bears the fairest name on earth, resolutely set its face against everything that is un-Lutheran, the various forms of unionism and synergism? In the past there has been much ground for complaint. We are thinking particularly of the *Opgjoer* and membership in the American Lutheran Conference.

A.

Seward Completes Fortieth School-Year. — Under this heading the *Southern Nebraska District Messenger* reviews the history of Concordia Teachers' College at Seward, Nebr., which has just completed its fortieth school-year. In the closing paragraph we find a thought which may encourage us in these days when we are confronted with so many serious difficulties. We read: "Thus a new institution, destined to be the most powerful single factor in the extension of our school system in this territory, was launched. Were the times so favorable for such an undertaking in 1894? Hardly. In the same issue of the *Lutheraner* in which the coming dedication of the first building is announced, there is an appeal for the drought-stricken people of Nebraska. Synod had chosen a relief committee, which reported: 'The western part of Nebraska has again been visited by drought. The need is great since the harvest has failed utterly, and there is no surplus from last year. Many are without the barest necessities of life.' In the same issue of this periodical Prof. A. Graebner of St. Louis is deeply concerned about the synodical debt, which had reached the total of \$10,628.90, a sum which was evidently considered

a serious matter in those days. A new *Lehrerseminar* in such times! How the spirit of Christian courage of so many of our synodical fathers again and again steps before us in their deeds and puts to shame the apparent defeatism of our age that is so ready to wail, 'We can't!'"

J. T. M.

Gettysburg Receives Large Bequest. — One of the largest bequests ever received by a Lutheran educational institution has come to Gettysburg Lutheran Theological Seminary upon the death of the late Charles Cronhardt, an eighty-year-old Baltimore resident. He named the Gettysburg institution as beneficiary in one half of his estate. It will amount to about \$450,000. It is to be applied to scholarship endowments. A portion of the income is to be used to erect a statue of Martin Luther on the campus of the institution. — *N. B. N. L. C.*

Union Services in Pittsburgh Not a Success. — If one might generalize concerning union summer services, one might draw the conclusion that the older they are, the poorer they are. Having watched the curve of a number of such movements, this is my conviction. Beginning with the middle of June such group meetings are held in Wilkinsburg, Squirrel Hill, Bellevue, South Hills, North Side, and, in fact, in nearly all distinct sections of the city. The most important group of twenty-one churches, which for sixteen years has been meeting in the beautiful and capacious Carnegie Music Hall, is not gaining in attendance and support. While still going strong, the interest is slowly decreasing.

John Ray Ewers, in the Christian Century.

Protestantismus in Amerika. „Das Institute of Social Research in New York hat unter der sachmännischen Leitung von Prof. Mark A. Mah, beraten von Prof. W. A. Brown vom Union Theological Seminary, drei Jahre lang eingehende Erhebungen gemacht über den derzeitigen Stand von neunzehn der größeren weißen Kirchen im Protestantismus in den Vereinigten Staaten und in Canada, und es hat das Resultat dieser Erhebungen nun in vier reichhaltigen Bänden herausgegeben.“ So beginnt der „Christliche Apologete“ einen Bericht über die genannten Untersuchungen. Es wird festgestellt, daß nur ein Drittel der protestantischen Prediger die wissenschaftliche und theologische Vorbildung habe, die jetzt erforderlich sei. „Das Durchschnittsgehalt sämtlicher Prediger habe im Jahre 1928 ungefähr demjenigen eines zweittelassigen (semiskilled) Berufsarbeiters entsprochen. Und in jener Zeit, also vor der Depression, habe das Durchschnittsgehalt eines Predigers in den Vereinigten Staaten und Canada 1,407 Dollars pro Jahr betragen. Eine Gemeinde müsse eine Mitgliedschaft von wenigstens dreihundert haben, um fähig zu sein, einen theologisch durchgebildeten Prediger bezahlen zu können; das können aber nur dreizehn Prozent der weißen protestantischen Gemeinden.“ Es soll ein Überschuß von vierzig- bis fünfzigtausend nur teilweise oder gar nicht theologisch geschulter Prediger vorhanden sein. Manches schiefes Urteil wird hier mit untergelaufen sein.

Als Ursache für den geschilderten Mißstand wird angegeben: Zersplitterung der Kirchen, Unheißigkeit des Lebens eines Predigers, Mangel an Übereinstimmung darüber, was die Pflichten eines heutigen Predigers seien, Uneinigkeit der Seminare in der Bestimmung darüber, wieviel von sozialer

Arbeit studiert werden solle, Mangelhaftigkeit der Seminarbibliotheken, zu geringe Bekanntschaft der Studenten und Kandidaten mit der theologischen Literatur, ungenügende Maßstäbe für die Verleihung eines Diplomas. Der „Apologete“ meint, der Hauptschade sei nicht genannt: Mangel an geistlichem Leben. Und dieser Mangel, so fügen wir hinzu, kommt her von dem Abfall von Gottes Wort.

II. Ausland.

Schleiermacher der Schutzpatron des Neuheidentums. Anlässlich des Todes Schleiermachers vor hundert Jahren wird dieser „Schutzpatron des Neuheidentums“, wie ihn die „Freikirche“ mit Recht nennt, besonders in deutschländischen Blättern jetzt wieder viel genannt und gerühmt. „Wir können uns in den Tagen religiöser Neubildung gar nicht genug mit Schleiermacher, dem größten evangelischen Theologen nach Luther, beschäftigen“, so schrieb im „Reichswart“ in einem Artikel, betitelt „Schleiermacher und unsere Zeit“, ein gewisser Karl Schulz. Dazu schreibt die „Freikirche“: „Es ist interessant, daß dieses Urteil über Schleiermacher sich im ‚Reichswart‘ findet. Es deckt sich mit dem, was zünftige Theologen der evangelischen Kirche erst kürzlich wieder über Schleiermacher geschrieben haben. Woher aber diese Begeisterung für Schleiermacher bei Karl Schulz? Weil Schleiermacher die Grundwahrheiten des Christentums verwirft. Angeführt werden folgende Worte, die der junge Schleiermacher an seinen Vater geschrieben hat: ‚Ich kann nicht glauben, daß der ewiger wahrer Gott war, der sich selbst nur den Menschensohn nannte; ich kann nicht glauben, daß sein Tod eine stellvertretende Versöhnung war, weil er es nie ausdrücklich gesagt hat und weil ich nicht glauben kann, daß sie nötig gewesen ist; denn Gott kann die Menschen, die er offenbar nicht zur Vollkommenheit, sondern nur zum Streben nach derselben geschaffen hat, unmöglich ewig darum strafen wollen, weil sie nicht vollkommen geworden sind.‘ Gerühmt wird an Schleiermacher, daß er ‚mosaische Religion‘ und die Heilige Schrift ‚keinesfalls für die ewigen Grundlagen der Religion ansah‘ und daß er sich gegen die Menschen gewendet habe, ‚die an einer toten Schrift hängen‘. Nach diesen seinen Aussprüchen eignet sich Schleiermacher sehr wohl zum Schutzpatron des Neuheidentums. Sie zeigen aber auch, daß er keinen Anspruch darauf hat, als evangelischer Theolog gepriesen und mit Luther in einem Atemzug genannt zu werden.“

Allerdings nicht jeder stimmt Schleiermacher zu. So schreibt z. B. im „Kirchenblatt“ der Ev.-Luth. Kirche in Preußen (Nr. 9, 1934) ein gewisser Artur Bach: „Uns ist Schleiermacher kein Prophet, uns ist er kein Führer der Kirche. Wir lehnen ihn und seine Theologie als Hezerei ab.“ Nachs Aussprache richtete sich gegen einen Artikel im „Reichswart“, in dem Schleiermacher als Kronzeuge echter Religiosität gerühmt wurde. Zum Beweis für dies Urteil wird dann die folgende Stelle aus Schleiermachers Schriften zitiert: „Jede Heilige Schrift ist nur ein Mausoleum der Religion, ein Denkmal, daß ein großer Geist da war, der nicht mehr da ist; denn wenn er lebte und wirkte, wie würde er einen so großen Wert auf einen toten Buchstaben legen, der nur ein schwacher Abdruck von ihm sein kann? Nicht der hat Religion, der an eine Heilige Schrift glaubt, sondern der, welcher keiner bedarf und wohl selbst eine machen könnte.“ „Das“, schreibt die „Freikirche“, „ist die von Luther in den Schmalkaldischen Artikeln so treffend

gegeißelte Schwärmergeister derer, „die zwischen dem Geist und Buchstaben scharfe Richter sein wollen und wissen nicht, was sie sagen oder sehen“, die „das äußerliche Wort verdammen und doch selbst nicht schweigen, sondern die Welt vollplaudern und -schreiben, gerade als könnte der Geist durch die Schrift oder mündlich Wort der Apostel nicht kommen, aber durch ihre [der Schwärmer] Schrift und Wort müßte er kommen“. Diese Kezerei hat aber die gesamte neuere Theologie, die an den deutschen Universitäten herrscht, vergiftet.“

J. L. M.

Zur Klärung der kirchlichen Lage in Deutschland. Hierüber schreibt die „A. E. L. N.“: „Der Widerhall auf die Erklärung des Bekenntnistages ist ungeheuer. Es laufen dauernd Zustimmungserklärungen ein. In einer Gemeinde haben sich z. B. durch handschriftliche Anmeldungen siebteinhundert Gemeindeglieder, das heißt, 95 Prozent der Wahlberechtigten, in wenigen Tagen der Bekenntnisgemeinschaft angeschlossen. In den letzten Tagen hat sich ferner eine große Anzahl von Pastoren, die entweder bei den Deutschen Christen oder bei den Neutralen gestanden haben, bei der Bekenntnisgemeinschaft angemeldet. Es wird deutlich, daß eine starke Klärung innerhalb aller Arbeitszweige der Landeskirche und ebenso innerhalb der bisher bei den Deutschen Christen stehenden Gruppen eingetreten ist. Damit bestätigt sich eine Erkenntnis, die kürzlich aus den Reihen der Deutschen Christen selbst in einer Besprechung mit den drei Präsidenten des Landeskirchenamts in aller Deutlichkeit gesagt worden ist: ‚Geben Sie sich keiner Illusion hin. Hinter uns steht der geringste Teil des Kirchenvolks.‘ Von erheblicher Bedeutung für die Beurteilung der Lage ist auch, daß der Missionsdirektor der Hermannsburger Mission Schomerus eindeutig die notwendige Zusammengehörigkeit von Bekenntnis und Mission angezeigt hat.“ Bedeutsam ist, daß am zweiten Osterfeiertag D. Freiherr von Pechmann aus der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche ausgetreten ist. In seinem Schreiben an den Reichsbischof erklärte er, daß er protestieren müsse durch den Austritt aus einer Kirche, „die aufgehört hat, Kirche zu sein“. Freiherr von Pechmann gehörte zu den führenden Männern des Weltluthertums und war von 1924 bis 1930 verfassungsmäßiger Präsident des Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchentages. Die „Freikirche“ bemerkt hierzu: „Diese Austrittsbewegung ist beachtenswert und insofern berechtigt und begründet, als ein solcher Tatprotest tatsächlich der einzige Weg ist, auf dem ein Christ sich der Mitverantwortung für schriftwidriges Wesen in der Kirche entziehen kann, wenn sein Einspruch dagegen unbeachtet bleibt.“

J. L. M.

Detailed Information on the Lutheran Movement among the Ukrainians. — The *News Bulletin* of the N. L. C. recently brought an article by Pastor Siegfried Lempp of Stanislaw, Poland, in which this movement, which has the support of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention, is described. We take over the chief paragraphs of this article: —

“It will soon be ten years now that a reformation has been in process among the Ukrainians, who constitute the majority population on the eastern border of Poland, at the door of Russia. Most of the Ukrainian people live in Russia, where also, as a result of uprooting experiences, a strong religious ferment exists, which is being suppressed by the bolshevistic terror. The Evangelical Movement there as also in Polish Wolhynia until now seems to have been in the hands of the sects. The

Ukrainians in Little Poland, formerly Galicia, are now turning away from the sects and striving toward a national Church. For this reason they have from the beginning inclined toward the existing Evangelical Diaspora Church, whose leader is Dr. Zoeckler in Stanislaw, the noted founder of large Evangelical Diaspora institutions. In the course of these ten years twenty evangelical congregations of the Lutheran confession have been established in the villages and towns near Stanislaw, where formerly the preaching of the Gospel was entirely unknown. There are at present eight Ukrainian preachers, of whom three are fully trained pastors and five are lay evangelists engaged in the work of preaching the Gospel. Four additional students of theology and eleven evangelists are being trained in Erlangen and Neuendettelsau.

"Four congregations have already erected chapels, whereas four others have made preparations for such buildings. The members of the young congregations are ready to make great sacrifices in order to build chapels, since there is no room for the services in their humble cottages. It is customary to hold the services in the open during the summer. In the winter those who cannot get inside crowd into the vestibule and stand at the windows. It is urgently necessary that more chapels be completed this year. . . .

"The Evangelical Movement has encountered the greatest difficulty. The entire strength of the Greek Union Church in Galicia has been thrown against it. In the congregation at Jezupol the members succeeded in building a simple chapel at the greatest sacrifices, but they are not given permission to use the building for services because it does not comply with the specifications of a house of worship.

"The transfer to the Lutheran confession is made difficult in every possible way. The Catholic clergy will not give the necessary documents. In addition, fees are demanded by the state authorities when official notice to go over to the Lutheran confession is given. These the poor people cannot pay. Above all, the people are aroused and incited against the Evangelical Church by much literature and by statements in the press. The opposition, however, is not succeeding. The Evangelical Movement is gaining very rapidly. Regular services have been begun in two additional villages in this month. The call for evangelical preaching is insistent from a number of other villages. Our ability is insufficient to undertake the work everywhere. Even in Wolhynia people are turning away from the sects and appealing for Lutheran preachers. It is a pity that this golden opportunity cannot be made use of.

"The services in Lutheran congregations are held with the full liturgy. The valuable old liturgy of the Eastern Church has been purified of its Catholic elements, but retained in its general form. In this way the people feel at home in the services in which the preaching of the pure Gospel is definitely the heart. In the past year an agenda was completed and given to the congregation for use. A new hymn-book for the service of worship was also printed in the past year. It contained in part translations of the evangelical chorals of the German and English churches and in part also old Ukrainian church hymns or such as have been revised.

"It was a great joy for the congregations that in the past year the

Augsburg Confession was translated into the Ukrainian language and may now take its place in the homes of the congregations by the side of Luther's Catechism, which had been translated some time before."

While its connections make one doubt that doctrinally the movement is entirely sound, we rejoice to hear of these victories of evangelical truth.

A.

Famine Conditions in Russia.—Reports from the Ukraine, the former granary of Europe, speak of the awful conditions which prevail in that part of Russia. One report, for example, from the single district of Kaliniwka, states that in the village of Saghwanschtechna 2,000 of the 3,500 inhabitants have died of hunger; that in Nemyrintzi, a village of 700 inhabitants, only four or five families have survived; that in Kumaniwka 1,400 of the 3,000 inhabitants have succumbed; and that in Sambovrodok in one year's time 800 of the 3,000 inhabitants have died. The greatest mortality is among children under fourteen years of age. The same reports speak of increasing cannibalism. The authorities have ordered that dead bodies may be interred only after decomposition has set in, as otherwise they are dug up and consumed. Cannibalism is now punished with capital punishment; but capital punishment no longer has any terror for these people. It is estimated that during the last eighteen months ten to fifteen million people have perished from hunger.—*Evangelical News Bureau in Holland.*

Aus Böhmen, wo, wie wir früher bereits gemeldet haben, eine große Bewegung zum Evangelium hin entstanden ist, bringt der „Reichsbote“ die Nachricht, daß in drei evangelischen Gemeinden unlängst private evangelische Volksschulen errichtet worden sind. Die Mittel dafür sind zum größten Teil von den Gemeinden selbst aufgebracht worden.

(Ev.-Luth. Freikirche.)

A Hoax?—With respect to the widely heralded information that six hundred Protestant pastors of Germany had asked the Pope to be received into the Catholic Church, it seems a real canard has been foisted on the American public. The *Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung* informs its readers that one man whose name figured in the startling dispatch joined the Roman Church, although there is merely an identity of names here, not of persons. The number six hundred seems to have developed from the more moderate figure four hundred, referring to a group of pastors who asked the Pope for protection of the Church, without, however, uttering any wish to come into the Roman fold. But the *Kirchenzeitung* declares that it even has no knowledge of these four hundred pastors with their strange request addressed to the Pope. Did here, too, the reporter manifest a greater attachment to fanciful writing than to absolute truth?

A.

A New Testament Manuscript.—The town library of Augsburg reports that it has in its possession a German Bible codex dating not later than the year 1350. It consists of 337 pages in small writing of the New Testament in a good German translation. In 1927 Prof. Dr. Adolf von Harnack resided in Augsburg for a considerable time in order to study this manuscript. He believed the codex to be a copy of a manuscript completed by a Regensburg Dominican order.—*Evangelical News Bureau in Holland.*

Book Review. — Literatur.

Die Heilsgewißheit bei Luther. Eine entwicklungsgeschichtliche und systematische Darstellung. Von Alfred Kurz. Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. 1933. 262 Seiten 6½×9½. Preis: M. 8, kartoniert.

„Unsere Untersuchung führt in das Herzstück des religiösen Lebens und theologischen Denkens Luthers. Mit der Frage: ‚Wie kriege ich einen gnädigen Gott?‘ sind wohl seine Klosterkämpfe richtig umschrieben; aber diese eine Frage umschließt die weitere: ‚Wie werde ich ein Mensch nach Gottes Wohlgefallen? Wie bleibt mir Gott gnädig in Ewigkeit? Wie werde ich meines Heils gewiß?‘“ Mit diesem Satz beginnt die Abhandlung. Und wenn der Leser, dem es um diese Sache zu tun ist, begierig der Ausführung folgt, so ist er nicht enttäuscht, sondern unterschreibt dankbar die Schlusssätze: „Es gibt ein ewiges Evangelium. Weil Luther dieses der Welt wiedergebracht hat, . . . durfte in seiner Leichenrede von dem Engel der Offenbarung gesprochen werden: ‚Der hatte ein ewiges Evangelium, zu verkündigen denen, die auf Erden wohnen‘, Offenb. 14, 6. Von diesem Evangelium gilt, was von Christus gesagt ist: ‚Jesus Christus gestern und heute und derselbe auch in Ewigkeit‘, Hebr. 13, 8. Zu ihm wollte Luther sein deutsches Volk führen, auf daß wir durch desselben Gnade gerecht und Erben seien des ewigen Lebens nach der Hoffnung. Das ist gewißlich wahr‘, Tit. 3, 7 f.“ Der Leser wird seinem Gott dankbar sein für das von Luther der Kirche wiedergeschenkte Lehrstück von der auf das Evangelium gegründeten Heilsgewißheit. Er wird auch dem Verfasser für seine vortreffliche Arbeit dankbar sein, die so manches Treffliche auf treffliche Weise zu sagen weiß. Erst wird Luthers Kampf um die Heilsgewißheit dargestellt, wie er auf dem Weg der Wertgerechtigkeit sich in einem „Inferno“ befand, wie er auf dem Weg der zugerechneten Gerechtigkeit in ein „Purgatorio“ kam und wie er auf dem Weg der Glaubensgerechtigkeit das „Paradiso“ erreichte. Unter der „zugerechneten Gerechtigkeit“ der zweiten Periode versteht der Verfasser das „Nichtzurechnen der Sünde durch Gottes freie Willensentscheidung“. Es handelt sich um den voluntaristischen Gottesbegriff Occams, der Luthers damalige Theologie beherrschte. Hinter der „gratia imputata“ stand nicht der gnädige Gott der Schrift, sondern der prädestinierende, absolute, freie Wille des occamistischen Gottes. „Am Anfang der Vorlesung [über den Römerbrief] stand der heilswungewisse Sünder vor einem Gott, der in unberechenbarer Willensentscheidung gerecht spricht und verdammt; am Ende ruft das in Christo begnadigte Gotteskind: ‚Abba, lieber Vater!‘ Occam ist endgültig durch Paulus besiegt. Luther hat die Theologie der Dialektik überwunden.“ (S. 146.) Die Sache des sogenannten „Turmerlebnisses“, von dem Luther in der Vorrede zur Gesamtausgabe seiner Werke redet (W. 54, 179 ff.: „Da fühlte ich mich ganz und gar als ein Wiedergeborner und meinte, durch offene Türen in das Paradies einzutreten“; vgl. St. L. Ausg. XIV, 448), wird gründlich untersucht. Kurz hält dafür, daß das „Turmerlebnis“ in den Monat September, spätestens Oktober, des Jahres 1516 fällt. Die Sache ist wichtig für das Verständnis des Römerbriefvorlesung und anderer Frühschriften. „Der Ausdruck ‚der gnädige Gott‘ ist hier noch nicht reformatorisch zu verstehen“ (S. 94), „auch nicht die Ausdrücke ‚Glaube‘ und ‚Nichtanrechnung‘“ (S. 83). In der zweiten Periode „wird nicht der Glaube, sondern die Demut, die Anerkennung des inneren Sündigseins, die Anfechtung

und das Nichthaben der Heilsgewißheit als heilsnotwendig hingestellt" (S. 87). „Von der Römerbriefvorlesung sagt Luther 1532, daß er in ihr zu einiger Erkenntnis Christi gekommen sei (Eischr. I, 136). Von seiner ersten Psalmenvorlesung hat er später überhaupt nicht mehr geredet. Das ist nicht Zufall, sondern Absicht. Selbst der Galaterbrief von 1519 ist nach seinem späteren Urteil nicht reif. „Luther wußte ganz genau, daß er die volle Erkenntnis des Reformators erst besaß, als er sich anschickte, den Psalter zum zweiten Male zu interpretieren.“ (S. 146.) „Vom achten Kapitel des Römerbriefes an, wo die Wandlung sich vorbereitete, finden sich Stellen, aus denen reformatorisches Morgenlicht leuchtet.“ (S. 67.) Es wird in diesem Teil des Buches anschaulich und ergreifend beschrieben, wie Luther von Stufe zu Stufe aufwärts geführt wurde, bis er, auf dem alleinigen Boden der Schrift stehend, seines Heilands, seines Glaubens froh sein konnte — das von Gott zubereitete Werkzeug der Reformation. Der zweite Teil behandelt „Die Heilsgewißheit bei Luther in systematischer Darstellung“. Die Heilsgewißheit gründet sich auf Wort und Sakrament, ist die vom Heiligen Geist durch Wort und Sakrament gewirkte Gewißheit. „Der Heilige Geist ist kein Skeptiker; er hat nicht Zweifelhafte und unsichere Meinungen in unsere Herzen geschrieben, sondern feste Gewißheiten, die fester und gewisser sind als selbst das Leben und alle Erfahrung. (W. 18, 605; St. L. Ausg. 18, 1681.)“ „In Ansetzungen schrieb er an seine Studentür oder auf seinen Schreibtisch: ‚Baptizatus sum!‘ Oder er sagt: ‚Meine Taufe bleibt, gleichwie die Sonne allezeit bleibt.‘ (W. 34, I, 97.)“ „Es nützt dir nichts zu glauben, daß Christus für die Sünden an derer dahingegeben sei, wenn du zweifelst, ob er für deine Sünden gestorben sei. Das glauben auch die Dämonen. Mit fester Zuversicht mußt du daran festhalten, daß er auch für deine Sünden gestorben ist und du einer von denen seiest, für deren Sünde er dahingegeben wurde. Das ist rechtfertigender Glaube. . . . Das ist das Zeugnis des Heiligen Geistes.“ (W. 2, 458; St. L. Ausg. 8, 1376.) — Auf zwei von Kurz hierbei betonte Punkte möchten wir noch besonders aufmerksam machen. 1. Synergismus und Heilsgewißheit vertragen sich nicht. „Ob wir die verschiedenen Formen des Heidentums oder des Judentums . . . daraufhin betrachten, überall findet sich der Versuch, irgendeinen menschlichen Standpunkt Gott gegenüber festzuhalten und einem — wenn auch noch so schwachen — Synergismus Raum zu schaffen. Luther dagegen hat allein von Gott und seinem Wort her geurteilt und mit dem Monergismus kompromißlos Ernst gemacht. Damit hängt seine Heilsgewißheit ganz eng und unmittelbar zusammen. Sie ist sofort aufgehoben, wenn sie von einem menschlichen Tun abhängig wird. Das weiß ich gewiß, daß ich nichts Menschliches rate, sondern Göttliches, indem ich alles Gott zuteile, dem Menschen nichts.“ (W. 40, 1. 1131. St. L. 9, 97.) Gott schafft nur aus dem ‚Nichts‘. ‚Ut eius natura, ex nihilo omnia creare, . . . sic creavit omnia. Sic iustificat peccatores, vivificat mortuos, salvat damnatos.‘ (W. 40, 3, 154. St. L. 4, 1873.)“ (S. 208 f.) 2. Erfahrungs- theologie (im modernen Sinn) und Heilsgewißheit vertragen sich nicht. „Nach dem Gesagten wird es immerhin gut sein, von einer Erfahrungsgrundlege des Glaubens bei Luther nicht zu reden. Die Zuversicht des Glaubens und die Gewißheit des Heiles bleibt auch ohne gegenwärtige Erfahrung und ist unabhängig vom gegenwärtigen Fühlen. Gott kann das Fühlen entziehen, ohne zugleich die Glaubenszuversicht zu nehmen. . . . Man wird nicht sagen dürfen, daß Luther Erfahrungstheolog sei. Er darf weder von einer Theologie in Anspruch genommen werden, die gegen alle Erfahrung streitet, noch von einer Theologie, die ihren Glaubensgrund in der Erfahrung besitzt.“ (S. 233 ff.)

„Auch den andern Fehler hat Luther vermieden, daß er nicht das religiös erlebende Ich zur religiösen Autorität machte und die Erfahrung verselbständigte.“ (S. 244.) — Bei alledem macht Kurz selber der Erfahrungstheologie einige Konzeptionen. Er sagt z. B.: „Wäre Luther ein Sonderfall, wie dürfte man dann eine Kirche auf seiner Lehre und seinem Erleben“ (von uns unterstrichen) „erbauen?“ (S. 256.) Oder: „Beides muß zusammenkommen: das Wort und das Angesprochensein durch Gott; die Erfahrung und ihre Konformität mit der Schrift. Wo das erlebt wird, da ist Heiliger Geist, da ist Offenbarung, da ist Gewißheit.“ (S. 244.) Damit soll natürlich mehr gesagt sein als dies, daß, um ein Christ zu sein, man ein Christ geworden sein muß, daß, um die Kraft der Heiligen Schrift zu erfahren, man sie erfahren muß. Was gemeint ist, ist, daß zum Wort Gottes noch etwas hinzukommen muß, damit es seine Kraft erweise. Auf eben dieser Seite lesen wir: „Gott muß Gott bleiben, und zwar sowohl dem erlebenden oder spekulierenden Ich als auch der Schrift gegenüber, die nicht ein Lehrbuch über Gottes Wesen und Willen ist, sondern erst durch den Heiligen Geist verlebendigt werden muß.“ In ähnlicher Weise wird S. 222 ein falscher Gegensatz gebildet: „Indem die Schrift ihm [Luther] diese Sicherheit bot, hatte sie doch solche Macht nicht als tote Autorität des geschriebenen Buchstabens, sondern als lebendiges Zeugnis des Heiligen Geistes“ — das allerdings „im Wort und bei dem Wort ist“. Aber warum denn hierbei von einer toten Autorität reden? Und S. 223 heißt es gar, in gesperrtem Druck: „Der geistgewirkte Glaube muß immer erst das Wort lebendig und zu einem wirklichen und persönlichen Gotteswort machen, um Heilsgewißheit zu wecken.“ Noch einige andere Sätze müssen beanstandet werden. Das ist schade, da der Verfasser zumeist Luther recht versteht. — Das Buch ist auch in sehr verständlicher Sprache geschrieben. Auch darüber freut sich der Verf.

E. h. Engelder.

The Original Jesus. (*Der Goldgrund des Lebensbildes Jesu.*) By Otto Borchert, D. D., Author of *Der Tod Jesu im Lichte seiner eigenen Worte und Taten.* Translated by L. M. Stalker. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1933. 480 pages, 5½×9. Price, \$3.50.

This is a valuable book, offering a fresh, original treatment of great questions having to do with the Life of lives. We are told in the editor's preface that the German original, which was published after the war, "has had a remarkable history. It had to wait for sixteen years before it found a publisher, having been offered and rejected no less than ten times" (p. 9). The editor's explanation is that the book was "ahead of its time." This seems plausible. It constitutes a defense of the Biblical Jesus, and such productions before the war were regarded as worthless anachronisms, which should not be permitted to cumber the ground of this highly intellectual, sophisticated, and almost omniscient age. "With the disillusionment brought about by the great war and the subsequent peace, it found its public, and its message went home. Many editions in the original German have been exhausted; it has been translated into Dutch, Danish, Swedish" (*ibid.*).

It is not easy to give an adequate description of this remarkable book in a few words. To begin with, we may emphasize that it is not a life of Christ as that term is commonly understood — an orderly, comprehensive account of what the gospels report of the earthly life of our Savior. The

events are not studied in their sequence; questions of chronology are not discussed; material of this nature is seldom referred to. What the author endeavors to do is to place before us facts and incidents from the life of Christ which will justify our acceptance of Thomas's confession: "My Lord and my God." The purpose of the work, then, is apologetic. It is designed to make credible Christ's "portrait in the form in which it is offered to us by the gospels" (p. 13). This is accomplished by demonstrating that the gospel story cannot be an invention. If it were a fictitious account, it would read altogether differently, the author shows. "We perceive in different races and in different centuries ideal figures, the creation of many heads and busy hands, often a tissue woven by many generations, the attempt having been made to glorify one man above his fellows; but it has not been successful in a single instance. In every case the deficiencies can easily be perceived, and the blots on the picture are very clearly visible to every one who is not wilfully short-sighted" (p. 14). Now think of Christ. "Like the dying Lavater we are aware of a breath from heaven playing around us when we come into Christ's presence; we feel that this Jesus is not of the earth and that the likeness is not made by human hands" (p. 16). But is it not likely or at least conceivable that the disciples of Jesus, loving and adoring their Master, kept out of the picture they drew of Him a number of blemishes and imperfections to produce a figure of perfect loveliness? Our author says he is aware that skeptics call the gospel picture of Jesus a creation of the disciples; but he holds it can be demonstrated that such a view is false, and the proof in his opinion lies in the many things in the life of Jesus which are "inglorious, strange, yes, even offensive" (p. 17). He continues: "One after another all have been offended in Him—the Baptist [?], the disciples, the people, the Christian community of the second century, the rising Catholic Church, the expositors of the Bible, our own hearts. It can be proved, and for the defense the proof is important, that as soon as men withdrew ["withdrew" must be a mistranslation; one would expect: "gave rein to"—W.A.] their opposition to the picture given in the gospels and followed their own imagination, they never painted the likeness with the colors used by the evangelists; for the figure that looks at us from the gospel story is not one which is always exalted and glorified, rather does it bear on its forehead, even to-day, the sign of much that is an offense. It has features that will never appeal as great to the natural man, features to which we have gradually to accustom ourselves and which are now an example to us only because, gazing at Jesus, we have become convinced of their worth. And these characteristics of which we speak are not only to be found here and there in the picture, so that one might think the evangelists had merely forgotten to erase them when they idealized the main traits—no, they are the basic features of the portrait of Jesus. But if this is so, then this portrait can be understood only as a product of the most scrupulous historical accuracy. The members of that early community did not find in themselves the solid foundations and the divine features of the Savior of the world; they gave them to us as they received them, even when they thereby outraged their own feelings" (*ibid.*). The issue of his study, the author says, will be, "that Jesus has not been transfigured by the hand of man, but that the community of the first century stood awestruck before

the story of His life, even when it was displeasing to them. We see Him as He was" (p. 20). The work is divided into two books, Book One treating of "the foolishness in the picture of Jesus; its value in the scientific defense of Christianity," Book Two of "the beauty of the picture: the beauty of Jesus exhibited anew to scorners and admirers." The book often reaches wonderful heights, for instance, in chapter 4 of Part Two, where the thesis is brought forward: "Jesus is still to-day at variance with the thought of all mankind; because the natural man, in so far [?] as he is stained by sin, sees in Him an enemy" (p. 73). Frederick the Great, Goethe, Nietzsche, Ibsen, Hauptmann, and others are quoted to show the deep chasm fixed between Christ and what the human mind, when left to its own resources, considers great and divine; the difference between the principles which Jesus taught His followers and those exalted and cheered by the intellectual leaders of to-day is emphasized. This powerfully confirms the above statement that we are here not dealing with an invention of the disciples. The chapter on "The Miracles of Christ" (pp. 401—427) likewise struck us as particularly admirable. The presentation is always simple and often gripping. A wealth of quotations is incorporated, showing the author's wide acquaintance with what is considered highest in the various literatures of the world. The translation, generally speaking, as far as we can judge without having the original before us, has been well done. In conclusion we must not fail to remark that the author's view of the inspiration of the Scriptures is the liberal one, which does not shrink from assuming errors in the sacred writings. May we not hope that, since he is looking upon Jesus as the true Son of God, a renewed careful consideration of the question whether the Bible is throughout inspired will result in his following our Lord, who acknowledged the Scriptures as divine and infallibly correct?

W. ARNDT.

Whipping-Post Theology; or: Did Jesus Atone for Disease? By Dr. W. E. Biederwolf. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 305 pages, 5½×8.

The somewhat queer title of this book, *Whipping-post Theology*, becomes intelligible to the reader when he considers the words of faith-healer Aimee Semple McPherson: "At the whipping-post He purchased your healing," or those of faith-healer Dr. McCrossan: "Much of His precious blood was doubtless shed while receiving those awful stripes for our *physical healing*; but the rest of His precious blood was reserved to be shed on the cross for our sins." Modern faith-healers thus apply Is. 53, 5 ("With His stripes we are healed") to bodily healing, claiming that the atonement was not only for sin, but also for *disease* and that accordingly it is the duty of the Christian evangelist to heal not only the soul, but also the body. It is chiefly this error with which Dr. Biederwolf, a noted evangelist himself and author of many other books on religion, takes issue. With keen analysis he examines the claim of modern divine healers in the light of Scripture and reaches the conclusion that it is "without warrant in the Word of God." His book is divided into three parts. In the first he compares the activities of modern divine healers with the healing of Christ during His sojourn on earth and shows by clear logic and excellent exposition that modern faith-healing is altogether unscriptural and in most cases fraudulent. As

a matter of fact, faith-healers usually do not *heal*, but leave those who appeal to them unhealed and unhelped. In the second part the author discusses the problem of divine healing from a practical point of view, showing that Jas. 5, 14, 15 cannot be used to support divine healing and that cases of sickness in the New Testament (Paul's thorn in the flesh; the sickness of his helpers on various occasions) argue against it. An important chapter in the third part of the book is that on the "History of Healing," in which he describes the movement from Montanus (A. D. 150) down to Pastor Rein in Germany (1875) and discusses Shakerism, Khlystism, Mormonism, Spiritualism, Christian Science, Simpsonism (the four-fold Gospel), New Thought, Unity, the Holy Ghost and Us Society, Emanuelism, Dowieism, Yogaism, Pentecostalism, etc. We recommend also the chapter on "An Examination of the So-called Proof-texts for Divine Healing," in which he proves that there is no shred of evidence in Scripture to support the divine healing of modern fanatics. We do not, however, agree with every statement or argument of the writer. Luther, for instance, should not be grouped among those who favored faith-healing; his prayer for the restoration of Melancthon does not make him a divine healer. Sometimes, too, the writer speaks as if disease were not the consequence of sin; by calling it an "imposed penalty," he admits that sickness, just like the briers, the pains of travail, death, etc., was caused by sin. In some cases his exegetical remarks go beyond the scope of the passages which he expounds. But despite such faults his work is a good refutation of the error of modern divine healing. We recommend especially the moderation and fair-mindedness with which the author treats the subject. He admits that "God does heal the afflicted in answer to the prayers of His believing children," but then continues: "But it is the gross perversion, the glaring distortion, the inexcusably unscriptural statement of the matter that is doing the hurt." The book is an exhaustive, thorough discussion of the perversion of modern divine healing.

J. T. MUELLER.

Cultural Anthropology. By *Albert Muntch, S. J.* 421 pages, 5½×8¾. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. Price, \$3.75.

A market flooded with books on ethnological subjects can ill afford to miss this contribution of Professor Muntch, who teaches anthropology in St. Louis University. For two reasons — the book is a compend such as we have needed covering practically everything of consequence pertaining to the customs, cultures, and beliefs of the uncivilized races; and we have stood in need of a book that presents the facts of anthropology in a manner free from the misconceptions arising from the atheistic, evolutionary, approach. The average text represents the so-called primitives as typical of a very early stage in the history of human society, out of which our race by slow evolution developed its culture and customs, its morals and its religion. The author of this work develops the thesis that there is no vestige of truth of such an evolution of human society. This twofold purpose runs through the entire book — to provide an answer to evolutionistic ethnology and to supply a text-book for classes and individuals that are making a study of primitive organization, ethics, art, and religion.

Throughout, Rev. Muntch takes pains to show the premises of Sir J. G. Frazer, E. B. Tylor, and Emile Durkheim to be at variance with the

facts. The theory of primitive universal rule by women, or matriarchy, one of the corner-stones of the evolutionistic structure, is shown to be "utterly worthless"; "the great mass of evidence stands solidly against it." The theory that human beings at first lived in sexual promiscuity and that the rule of one wife for each husband arose much later has gone by the board since the facts were more carefully investigated (pp. 9, 189). Indeed, as in the study of biology, so also in anthropology the evolutionary view has suffered one crushing defeat after another, the facts refusing to accommodate themselves to the theory of development out of brute beginnings. The author does not try to account for the differences in cultural levels. "Whence the initiative of some people comes is as much a mystery as is the ultimate source of the high endowments of certain individuals" (p. 30). Concerning some tribes it is evident that a degeneration from higher culture has set in, and "the idea of universal, steady, continual upward cultural progress must be given up, once and for all, as contrary to patent facts" (p. 42).

The reader of this work will receive an altogether new impression of the mentality of the primitive if his earlier reading has been limited to evolutionistic texts, texts whose authors are accustomed to seek out the most degrading aspects of primitive society and to fix upon them as the first stage of human progress. But this method is outmoded, says Professor Muntch. "It cannot be shown that man was brutelike in mind, habits, and behavior. . . . We realize that early man was like man of to-day. Human nature is the same to-day as it was when man first appeared on the horizon. . . . Primitive men reason as other men: their sentiments are the same; their moral sense and effort are the same as those of civilized man" (pp. 45, 46). From the beginning, man has had the gift of reason. There is no "prelogical stage." The mental processes of the savage do not differ from our own. Oft-quoted examples of mental backwardness — such as the alleged ignorance of certain tribes as to the bearing of sexual intercourse on conception — are relegated to the land of fancy. There is much proof that the savages of our day have sunk from relatively high stages of culture.

Especially the chapters dealing with mythology and religion are refreshing with their unprejudiced approach. The author finds no proof that the higher religions have developed out of totemism and other forms of idolatry (p. 128). "Primitive man knows the essentials of the Moral Law. . . . The great boast of evolutionary theorists is that they hold to facts and that their opponents are being led astray by preconceived ideas of what ought to be. Neither of these two contentions is true to fact. . . . All the data point only in one direction — the existence of well-defined ethical notions among people to whom many writers have denied concepts of moral right and wrong" (pp. 182—186). Monkeys can never develop a language, while on the other hand vocabularies of savage tribes "are rich and their grammatical structure is systematic and intricate" (p. 229). Many examples are given also from the author's own research during his sojourn with American Indian tribes. Most certainly "the languages of primitive peoples do not indicate a low mentality" (p. 241). As for religion, some form of religious belief is found among all peoples (p. 273); a belief in a Supreme Being — Creator, Ruler, Lawgiver — is in varying

degrees found among three-fourths or perhaps more of the non-civilized tribes of the world (p. 268). Not everywhere is proof available to show that present religious beliefs are a degeneration from higher levels. However, in all the vast field covering the five continents there "has not been produced any fact that militates against belief in primitive revelation" (p. 288).

The darker sides of heathen life are presented,—not so much in the chapters on family, womanhood, and childhood (where the reviewer was somewhat disappointed by the rather engaging and to that extent untrue picture there presented of life among the savages) as in the sections dealing with secret societies and with tabus, witch-doctors, cannibalism. It is to be regretted that the heartlessness and cruelty which is characteristic of most of the pagan tribes untouched by our civilization is not properly emphasized, though we owe a debt of gratitude to the writer for modifying his detail in the sections treating nature-worship, sections which, in the average anthropological text, reek with obscenity.

THEODORE GRAEBNER.

Teaching Religion To-Day. By *George Herbert Betts*. The Abingdon Press. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 268 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.25.

If any one of our readers is looking for a survey of modern methods in teaching religion, he may find this a usable book. The modernistic trend of the book is illustrated by the following quotations: "Let us acquaint the children with such facts as these concerning the Bible. Let us tell them when they arrive at the age when they question how the Bible grew and how the wisdom, mistakes, beliefs, hopes, and experiences of many people went into it. Let us treat its traditions, its legends, its myths, its allegories, and its poetry openly for what they are. Let us tell the beautiful Genesis story, but tell it as the way an ancient people who believed in God accounted for His creation of the earth." (P. 184.) In the chapter entitled "God in Our Teaching" we read: "We can wonder and worship where we cannot grasp or understand. We can reach out with loyalty and devotion to a Greatness which we cannot comprehend, let alone reduce to speech and explanation. Yet, wholly in accord with this attitude and point of view are certain principles which seem sound: 1. What we believe and teach about God should be in accord with accepted knowledge. Religion should keep step with progress in human thought. 2. What we believe and teach about God should represent the weight of probabilities as represented by reason." (P. 207.) And in the chapter on "Jesus in Our Teaching": "Now, certain theologians argue with great ingenuity and sometimes with infinite confusion of meaning that Jesus was both human and divine, being at the same time 'very God' and 'very man,' two natures separate and distinct, yet mysteriously fused. But what the common man wants to know is this: Was Jesus completely human in the sense that He met the same problems and tests that we have to meet and with no other resources than those available to every man to the extent he is able to use them? Or, on the other hand, was Jesus so hedged about by divinity that He had resources of which we have no knowledge? This is an important question that matters greatly. For we are taught that Jesus revealed in His life

what man may become. We are urged to model our lives upon His and to measure ourselves by His standard. This is challenging and inspiring if Jesus won His victories with the equipment that every man may have and if He differed from the rest of us only in degree and not in kind, in the weapons He used. But if we believe that Jesus, because of a unique relation to God, was so equipped that He could not fail and that every battle was won before it was begun, then there seems an element of injustice in expecting us with our lesser equipment to approximate the level He reached. If Jesus was not human in the full sense in which we are human, or if He was divine in a sense in which we may not be divine, then He was but playing at being a man, and we should not be measured by His standard. What we believe and what we teach the young on this question has a vital bearing on life and character. Is it not probable that in our teaching we need to emphasize more the human Jesus, who has been eclipsed in theology by the divine Jesus?" (Pp. 231. 232.)

THEO. LAETSCH.

Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina. Von Gustaf Dalman. Band III: Von der Ernte zum Mehl: Ernten, Dreschen, Worfeln, Sieben, Verwahren, Mahlen. (Schriften des Deutschen Palästina-Instituts, herausgegeben von G. Dalman. 6. Band.) Mit 71 Abbildungen. C. Bertelsmann in Gütersloh. 379 und XI Seiten 6½×9½ in Kleinwand mit Rücken- und Deckeltitel gebunden. Preis: M. 20.50.

Band I und II dieses Werkes haben wir in „Vehre und Wehre“ besprochen (74, 181; 75, 182). Wir können nur unsere dortige Empfehlung wiederholen. Es ist ein sehr wertvolles, interessantes Werk, von dem verfaßt, der als die erste heutige Autorität auf dem Gebiet der Palästinaforschung gilt, der nicht nur viele Jahre in Palästina zugebracht hat, sondern auch jetzt der Leiter des Palästina-Instituts an der Universität Greifswald ist. Der Inhalt des vorliegenden Bandes ist durch den Untertitel genügend bezeichnet. Er begleitet das Getreide von der Ernte bis zum Mahlen und zur Verwahrung des Mehls. Der nächste Band wird sich mit dem Brot, zugleich aber auch mit dem Öl, dem Wein und dem Fruchtbau beschäftigen und damit die Reihe beendigen. Der Verfasser geht immer aus von den Zuständen und Verhältnissen Palästinas, wie sie im Alten und Neuen Testament geschildert oder angedeutet werden, und beschreibt diese Zustände und Verhältnisse in der Gegenwart, gibt darum auch immer die betreffenden hebräischen, aramäischen und arabischen Wörter an. So kommt es, daß beständig in dem Buche sich sachliche Erklärungen zur Heiligen Schrift finden, wie darum auch das Verzeichnis der erwähnten und besprochenen Bibelstellen dreieinhalb eng gedruckte Seiten füllt. Wir geben ein paar Beispiele. Das Ährenlesen, wie es im Buche Ruth geschildert wird, wird genau erklärt und gezeigt, wie noch jetzt dieselbe Weise befolgt wird (S. 60—62). Ebenso wird das in der Bibel erwähnte Dreschen mit dem sogenannten Dreschwagen oder -schlitten sehr genau und anschaulich beschrieben (S. 89). Dasselbe gilt von dem Abschneiden des Getreides mit der Sichel (S. 41 f.). Es ist wirklich kein Abschnitt im ganzen Buche, der nicht interessanten und belehrenden Aufschluß über das gesamte Ackerbauleben im alten und jetzigen Palästina gäbe. Aber ganz besonders müssen auch die sechsundsiebzig Abbildungen, die auf photographischen Aufnahmen ruhen, beachtet werden. Wir leben eben jetzt im Zeitalter des Bildes, und gerade diese Bilder, die der Verfasser des Werkes entweder selbst aufgenommen hat oder andern Aufnehmern verdankt, machen die

Sache recht verständlich. So Nr. 49 das ausgezeichnete charakteristische Bild einer Handmühle, von zwei Frauen bei Nazareth gemahlen. Das ist ein Bild zu Luf. 17, 35: „Zwei werden mahlen miteinander; eine wird angenommen, die andere wird verlassen werden.“ Ebenso Nr. 15, ein dreschendes Kind mit Holzring und Maulkorb, eine Aufnahme der American Colony in Jerusalem, die sofort an das Wort erinnert: „Du sollst dem Ochsen, der da drischt, nicht das Maul verbinden“, 5 Mos. 25, 4; 1 Tim. 5, 18. Ebenso die Bilder von dem Dreschschlitten, von der Worfschaukel oder Wurfgabel und andere mehr. Das Buch ist mit einem vierfachen Register versehen: 1. Verzeichnis der hebräischen und aramäischen Wörter; 2. Verzeichnis der jetzt gebrauchten arabischen Wörter; 3. das Sachverzeichnis, das neun Seiten füllt, und schließlich das oben erwähnte Verzeichnis der behandelten Schriftstellen. Die wirklich ausgezeichneten Bilder sind alle auf Glanzpapier gedruckt, und das ganze Werk ist ein solches, an dem man seine Freude haben kann.

L. FÜRBRINGER.

Confirmation Sermons. By *Harold L. Yochum*. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 143 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.00.

These sermons, fourteen in number, coming from the pen of a pastor of the American Lutheran Church, are in the main good, helpful discourses, which can aid pastors in preparing addresses intended for young people. In view of the controversy on election which American Lutheranism passed through we were much interested in the author's treatment of Eph. 1, 3—6, one of the *sedes* of this doctrine. What we read on page 117 was quite reassuring: "The mystery of the salvation of some and the rejection and damnation of others lies not in God's will, but in man's will. 'God will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.' But some simply will not be saved and will not come to the knowledge of the truth. And though we may be charged with inconsistency, we hold to what the Scripture tells us: If any are saved, it is alone by God's grace; if any are lost, it is alone by their own fault." To be sure, to say that the mystery here involved lies in man's will might be understood to mean that it is man himself whose decision determines his fate, either his salvation or his eternal ruin. But the context seems to show that such a view is not in the mind of the author. He could and should have avoided the difficulty by simply acknowledging the mystery, without any attempt at making the two parallel truths converge in one focal point (*i. e.*, man's will). But what shall we say of these sentences in the same sermon (p. 118): "There is a genuine feeling of blessedness in knowing that God has known from all eternity that we would believe and continue in our faith and devotion to the end of our lives. Knowing this, He has chosen us for His own." This is simply the old *intuitu-fidei* teaching, which, after the clarifying intersynodical discussions, we had hoped, was quite effectually buried. Certainly God knew from eternity that we should believe; but that was not the reason why He chose us. It is unfortunate that the preacher did not adhere to his text; for there two factors only are mentioned which had a determining influence on God's election; the good pleasure of His will ("His grace") and Christ ("He hath chosen us in Him"). Man's faith does not figure among the causes of our predestination. We hope that in a second edition the erroneous or misleading statements will be corrected.

W. ARNDT.

Women of the Old Testament. By *Abraham Kuyper, LL. D., D. D.*
Translated by *Prof. Henry Zylstra*. 120 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Zonder-
van Publishing House. Price: Paper, 60 cts.; cloth, \$1.00.

Women of the New Testament. By *Abraham Kuyper, LL. D., D. D.*
Translated by *Prof. Henry Zylstra*. 73 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Zonder-
van Publishing House. Price: Paper, 60 cts.; cloth, \$1.00.

The author offers fifty character sketches of women of the Old Testament and thirty of women of the New Testament. Naturally, each sketch is very brief. While the volumes contain striking thoughts and practical applications, yet one time and again gains the impression as if there were too little objective expounding of Scripture and too much subjective reading into the text of one's own thoughts.

T. LAETSCH.

The Best-Loved Religious Poems. A collection by *James Gilchrist Lawson*. F. H. Revell Co. 265 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8$. Price, \$1.75.

A better collection than the average. The selections are grouped under such heads as Atonement, Missions, Giving, Heaven, Forgiveness, etc. If used with discernment, it may be very helpful in offering material for sermons, addresses, school and Sunday-school programs, etc. The price is somewhat high.

W. G. POLACK.

Philipp 2. Der marcionitische Ursprung des Mythosfahes Phil. 2, 6. 7. Von D. Dr. Ernst Barnikol. 1932. Walter-G. Muhlau-Verlag, Kiel. 134 Seiten $7\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{3}{4}$. Preis: RM 4.00.

Zurück zum alten Glauben: Jesus der Christus. Ein evangelischer Ruf an deutsche Theologen und Laien. Von Ernst Barnikol. 1933. Akademie-Verlag, Halle. 68 Seiten $6\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$. Preis: RM 2.00.

Wir nennen diese beiden Bücher zusammen; denn sie gehören nach Sinn und Geist zusammen. Allerdings würden wir unter andern Umständen diesen beiden Büchern kaum die Ehre antun, sie an dieser Stelle auch nur zu erwähnen. Aber wir fühlen uns gedrungen, sie als abschreckende Beispiele hinzustellen. Als ein solches bezeichnet sich eigentlich das erste Buch schon durch seinen Titel. Es ist eine Abhandlung, die der ganzen Textkritik und der gesamten Heiligen Schrift zum Hohne die Erniedrigung des ewigen Gottessohnes leugnet, und das mit dem frommen Vorgeben, durch Beseitigung der Philippusstelle einer marcionitischen Entstellung zu begegnen. Noch schlimmer steht es aber mit der zweiten Abhandlung, die einen so frommen und ansprechenden Titel trägt. Dieser Titel ist mit Hinsicht auf den tatsächlichen Inhalt des Buches geradezu eine Blasphemie zu nennen. Denn der Verfasser leugnet die Authentie der Pastoralbriefe und nennt die Briefe an die Epheser und an die Kolosser deuteropaulinisch; er leugnet die Präexistenz, die Ewigkeit, Jesu Christi, des Heilandes; er hat keine Ahnung von der Schriftlehre von der heiligen Dreieinigkeit, von der *communio naturarum* und der *communicatio idiomatum*. Er zeigt an vielen Stellen eine traffe Unwissenheit betreffs der neuesten archäologischen Funde. Kurz, unter dem Schein großer Gelehrsamkeit verbirgt Barnikol einen Animus gegen klar geoffenbarte Schriftwahrheiten, den selbst die Naivität eines Gleichgesinnten kaum verwinden könnte. Wir raten dem Verfasser, sich angelegentlich mit dem Großen und dem Kleinen Katechismus Luthers zu befassen, vor allem aber die Schrift so zu lesen, wie sie tatsächlich vorliegt. Möge ihm dann der Heilige Geist die Augen öffnen, daß er seine grundstürzenden Irrtümer erkennt und — hoffentlich öffentlich — widerruft!

P. E. K r e g m a n n.

Why Not Episcopal. By *William Dallmann, D. D.* Northwestern Publishing House Print, Milwaukee, Wis. 16 pages, 5×7½. Price, 10 cts. the copy; \$3.50 the hundred. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This new tract by Dr. Dallmann, based on authoritative sources, offers the chief reasons why a Lutheran cannot join the Episcopal Church. The author gives twenty-one points in support of his thesis, and every point is presented in a well-balanced and convincing manner. The tract ought to prove of value, not only in keeping Lutherans from straying into the wrong fold, but also for the use of young people in topic discussions. It will help to strengthen Lutheran consciousness and give a better conviction of Bible truths.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Statistical Year-Book of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States for the Year 1933. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 194 pages, 5½×8¼. Price, \$1.00.

The appearance of this yearly report is more than a matter of mere routine; for Pastor E. Eckhardt, the statistician of Synod, has a way of interpreting the cold figures of his report so as to make them live before our eyes. We have in this report not only the customary statistical material concerning the congregations, but in addition more than 40 pages telling about the languages used in the services of our Synod, the higher institutions of learning, the various missions of the Missouri Synod and the Synodical Conference, Concordia Publishing House, the charitable institutions within the Church, dedications of churches and jubilees of congregations, the average offering per communicant for budgeted treasuries, and many other items of interest. If the information here presented were regularly passed on by every pastor to all the communicant members of his congregation, we should certainly have well-informed church-members and most likely also willing workers in the Lord's kingdom.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Synodalbericht des Brasilianischen Distrikts der Ev.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio u. a. St. 1934. Casa Publicadora Concordia, Porto Alegre. 69 Seiten 6×9.

Dieser Bericht bringt außer den üblichen Geschäftsverhandlungen, die schon an sich sehr interessant sind, ein überaus wichtiges und zeitgemäßes Referat über „Unionismus“; P. R. F. Glötsch, Referent. In drei klaren Thesen wird hier die Stellung des Wortes Gottes zum Ausdruck gebracht, und zwar in einer sehr entschiedenen Weise, ohne aber in irgendeiner Weise durch Nominalenkelnus herauszufordern. Wir freuen uns von Herzen über dieses Zeugnis unserer Brüder in Brasilien und möchten das Studium dieses Berichts allen Brüdern auf das angelegentlichste empfehlen. Zugleich weisen wir auch hin auf die Synodal-Doppelnummer des „Ev.-Luth. Kirchenboten von Argentinien“, der einen ausführlichen Bericht über die diesjährige Synodalsitzung zu Urdinarrain bringt. Exemplare sind zu 10 Cents das Stück portofrei erhältlich von Rev. Carl H. Wolf, 353 Chapin St., Chadron, Nebr.

P. E. K r e t z m a n n.

St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Concordia, Mo. A Brief History and a Souvenir. Prepared for the ninetieth anniversary of the dedication of its first church-building in 1844. 35 pages, 6×9. Price, 35 cts. Order from Rev. Oscar Heilman, Concordia, Mo.

This is a well-written and beautifully illustrated booklet relating the history of one of our old and important congregations, especially dear to many pastors as the organization which founded their alma mater, St. Paul's College. It would be difficult to overestimate the influence of this congregation on the development of Lutheranism in the western part of the State of Missouri. In Pastors Biltz and Brust, the latter now the assistant pastor, it has had ministers who stood in the very front ranks of our clergy.

W. ARNDT.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:—

Concordia Collection of Sacred Choruses and Anthems for More Ambitious Choral Organizations. No. 40: *Awake, My Soul, in Joyful Lays.* Mixed chorus. By *Ros Vors.* 7 pages, 7×10. Price, 25 cts. No. 41: *The Lord's Day.* Mixed chorus. By *Matthew N. Lundquist.* 7 pages. Price, 25 cts.

The Trebalto Collection. Two-part and Three-part Choir Numbers, Mostly for Use in Church Service. No. 107: *Therefore My Heart Is Glad.* Two- and three-part. By *Martin H. Schumacher.* 5 pages, 7×10. Price, 15 cts.

The Seminary Edition of Choruses and Quartets Classical and Modern for Male Voices. Edited by *Walter Wismar.* No. 15: *O Lamb of God.* By *Matthew N. Lundquist.* 2 pages. Price, 10 cts. No. 16: *Cantate Domino.* By *Matthew N. Lundquist.* 3 pages. Price, 10 cts.

From Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:—

Deep Snow. An Indian story. 152 pages, 5×7½. Price: Paper, 60 cts.; cloth, \$1.00.

From Harper & Brothers, New York and London:—

Life's Beginnings. Wisdom and Counsel for Daily Guidance. Compiled by *F. J. N.* and *C. D. M.* 376 pages, 4½×5½.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us—one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Aug 34" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.